

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 10, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

The Reverend Timothy J. O'Brien, professor of political science, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we petition You today to bless the work of this legislative body, the members' staffs, and interns. We acknowledge You as the Lord of all that is and all that will be. Give us the courage to labor vigorously in the building of Your Kingdom—a Kingdom that grants justice to all and a serenity that alone comes from knowing, loving, and serving You.

Forgive our sins—both those in our personal lives as well as those we are communally responsible for as a nation and as a society.

Help us heal the wounds caused by injustice and selfishness, and help us create a society that is fair and compassionate to all.

We thank You for Your many blessings and ask that You continue to lift up leaders that inspire by word and deed so that Your will may be realized. We ask this in Your name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 292, nays 103, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

YEAS—292

Abercrombie	Anthony	Bateman
Ackerman	Applegate	Bellenson
Alexander	Archer	Bennett
Anderson	Aspin	Berman
Andrews (ME)	AuCoin	Bevill
Andrews (TX)	Bacchus	Bilbray
Annunzio	Barnard	Bonior

Borski	Hatcher	Orton
Boucher	Hayes (LA)	Owens (UT)
Boxer	Hefner	Packard
Brewster	Hertel	Pallone
Brooks	Hoagland	Panetta
Broomfield	Hochbrueckner	Patterson
Browder	Horn	Payne (NJ)
Brown	Horton	Payne (VA)
Bruce	Houghton	Pease
Bryant	Hoyer	Pelosi
Bustamante	Hubbard	Penny
Byron	Huckaby	Perkins
Callahan	Hughes	Peterson (FL)
Campbell (CO)	Hutto	Peterson (MN)
Cardin	Jefferson	Petri
Carper	Jenkins	Pickett
Carr	Johnson (CT)	Pickle
Chapman	Johnson (SD)	Porter
Clement	Johnson (TX)	Poshard
Clinger	Johnston	Price
Coleman (TX)	Jones (GA)	Pursell
Collins (IL)	Jones (NC)	Rahall
Collins (MI)	Jontz	Rangel
Combest	Kanjorski	Ravenel
Condit	Kaptur	Ray
Conyers	Kasich	Reed
Costello	Kennedy	Richardson
Cox (CA)	Kennelly	Rinaldo
Cox (IL)	Kildee	Ritter
Cramer	Klecza	Roe
Darden	Klug	Roemer
Davis	Kolbe	Rose
DeFazio	Kolter	Rostenkowski
DeLauro	Kopetski	Rowland
Dellums	Kostmayer	Roybal
Derrick	Lancaster	Russo
Dicks	Lantos	Sabo
Dingell	LaRocco	Sangmeister
Dixon	Laughlin	Sarpalius
Donnelly	Lehman (CA)	Sawyer
Dooley	Lent	Scheuer
Dorgan (ND)	Levin (MI)	Schiff
Downey	Levine (CA)	Schulze
Dreier	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Durbin	Livingston	Serrano
Dwyer	Long	Sharp
Dymally	Lowey (NY)	Shaw
Early	Luken	Shuster
Eckart	Manton	Siskisky
Edwards (CA)	Markey	Skaggs
Edwards (TX)	Matsui	Skeen
Emerson	Mavroules	Skelton
Engel	Mazzoli	Slattery
English	McCloskey	Slaughter (NY)
Erdreich	McCrery	Slaughter (VA)
Espy	McDermott	Smith (FL)
Evans	McEwen	Smith (IA)
Fascell	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Fazio	McMillen (MD)	Snowe
Feighan	McNulty	Solarz
Fish	Mfume	Spence
Flake	Miller (CA)	Spratt
Foglietta	Mineta	Staggers
Ford (MI)	Moakley	Stallings
Ford (TN)	Mollohan	Stark
Frank (MA)	Montgomery	Stenholm
Frost	Moody	Stokes
Gejdenson	Moorhead	Studds
Gephardt	Moran	Swett
Geren	Morella	Swift
Gibbons	Morrison	Synar
Gillmor	Mrazek	Tallon
Gilman	Murtha	Tanner
Glickman	Myers	Tauzin
Gonzalez	Nagle	Taylor (MS)
Gordon	Natcher	Thomas (GA)
Gradison	Neal (MA)	Thornton
Green	Neal (NC)	Torres
Guarini	Nussle	Towns
Gunderson	Oakar	Trafficant
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Traxler
Hall (TX)	Obey	Unsoeld
Hamilton	Olin	Valentine
Hammerschmidt	Oliver	Vander Jagt
Harris	Ortiz	Vento

Visclosky  
Volkmmer  
Walsh  
Washington  
Waters  
Weiss

Wheat  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolpe

Wyden  
Wylie  
Yates  
Yatron

NAYS—103

Allard	Goodling	Ramstad
Armey	Goss	Regula
Baker	Grandy	Rhodes
Ballenger	Hancock	Ridge
Barrett	Hansen	Riggs
Bentley	Hastert	Roberts
Bereuter	Hefley	Rogers
Billirakis	Henry	Rohrabacher
Biiley	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehlert	Hobson	Roth
Boehner	Holloway	Roukema
Bunning	Hunter	Santorum
Burton	Hyde	Saxton
Camp	Ireland	Schaefer
Campbell (CA)	James	Schroeder
Chandler	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Lagomarsino	Shays
Coleman (MO)	Leach	Sikorski
Coughlin	Lewis (CA)	Smith (OR)
Crane	Lewis (FL)	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Lightfoot	Stump
Dannemeyer	Machtley	Sundquist
DeLay	Mariennee	Taylor (NC)
Dickinson	Martin	Thomas (CA)
Doolittle	McCandless	Thomas (WY)
Duncan	McCollum	Upton
Edwards (OK)	McGrath	Vucanovich
Fawell	McMillan (NC)	Walker
Fields	Meyers	Weber
Franks (CT)	Michel	Wolf
Gallegly	Miller (OH)	Young (AK)
Gallo	Miller (WA)	Zeliff
Gekas	Murphy	Zimmer
Gilchrest	Oxley	
Gingrich	Quillen	

NOT VOTING—37

Andrews (NJ)	Jacobs	Owens (NY)
Atkins	LaFalce	Parker
Barton	Lehman (FL)	Paxon
Clay	Lipinski	Sanders
Cooper	Lloyd	Savage
Coyne	Lowery (CA)	Solomon
de la Garza	Martinez	Stearns
Dornan (CA)	McCurdy	Torricelli
Gaydos	McDade	Waxman
Gray	Mink	Weldon
Hayes (IL)	Molinari	Young (FL)
Hopkins	Nichols	
Inhofe	Nowak	

□ 1223

Mr. KOLTER changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KLECZKA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 276. An act to designate the Federal building located at 1520 Market Street in St. Louis, Missouri as the "L. Douglas Abram Federal Building";

S. 591. An act to require airbags for certain newly manufactured vehicles; and

S. 1012. An act to authorize appropriations for the activities and programs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that, pursuant to section 1295(b) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-595, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, ex officio; Mr. BREAU, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Mr. LOTT, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; and Mr. MACK, at large; to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that, pursuant to section 194(a), of title 14, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-595, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Mr. PACKWOOD, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; and Mr. SEYMOUR, at large; to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

## WELCOME TO FATHER TIMOTHY O'BRIEN

(Mr. KLECZKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I again welcome Fr. Timothy O'Brien to the House Chamber as our guest chaplain.

This marks the fourth summer that Father O'Brien has directed the Marquette University Congressional Intern Program. This program provides the valuable experience of working on Capitol Hill, as well as a vigorous academic overview of the Congress, to more than 30 undergraduate and graduate students from throughout the country.

The Marquette Intern Program has motivated numerous young men and women—including two members of my own staff—to enter the field of public service as legislative aides.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Father O'Brien for over 20 years, and have the highest respect for him, not only as a dedicated member of the clergy, but also as a gifted scholar, teacher, and friend.

In his 22 years as a priest in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee, and 14 years as a professor of political science at

Marquette University, Father O'Brien had gained a reputation as an authority on the subject of religion in politics, interest group politics, and congressional procedure.

I ask the House to join me in extending a warm welcome to our distinguished guest, Father O'Brien.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLECZKA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and to add that Father O'Brien has rendered an excellent service to the U.S. Congress and to the Marquette interns. The best interns on Capitol Hill come from Marquette University; and the Jesuits can be proud of all of them. We in Congress salute, the interns, Tim O'Brien, S.J. and Marquette University.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests at a later time with the exception of the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

## INVITATION TO UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF FORMER SPEAKER JIM WRIGHT

(Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I would take this opportunity to invite the Members to the unveiling of the portrait of former Speaker Jim Wright. It will be done this afternoon at 5 o'clock in Statuary Hall.

We will be honored by the presence of our current Speaker, the illustrious gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], and by our current minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and others.

It will not be a long program. We look forward to seeing you there. We will have a reception immediately after that in the Rayburn Room, and we look forward to seeing you.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,

July 9, 1991.

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Jim Edgar, Governor, State of Illinois certifying that, according to the official returns of the Special Election held on July 2, 1991 the Hon-

orable Thomas W. Ewing was elected a Member of the House of Representatives from the Fifteenth Congressional District, State of Illinois.

With great respect I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

Know Ye That I, Jim Edgar, Governor of the State of Illinois do hereby certify that the Official Abstracts of the votes cast in the 15th Congressional District of the State of Illinois for member of the 102d Congress on Tuesday the 2d day of July, 1991 were duly canvassed by the State Board of Elections as is provided by law and from the canvass of said abstracts it appears.

And I do hereby Certify, That Thomas W. Ewing of the County of Livingston was duly elected a member of the House of Representatives of the 102d Congress of the United States from the 15th Congressional District of the State of Illinois and is entitled to a seat in said 102d Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Edward R. Madigan.

## SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS W. EWING, OF ILLINOIS, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Member-elect from Illinois, Mr. EWING, come forward and take the oath of office.

The Chair will invite the members of the Illinois delegation to accompany the Member-elect to the well.

Mr. EWING appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are a Member of the House of Representatives.

□ 1230

## INTRODUCTION OF THOMAS EWING

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we are very fortunate, obviously, on our side of the aisle today, to present a new Member to the House of Representatives, TOM EWING, from Pontiac, IL, a neighboring district of mine.

Members will all recall our good friend, Ed Madigan, has moved on to other pursuits, and the seat was vacated as a result of Ed having moved on. TOM EWING is a veteran member of the Illinois Legislature for some 17 years, having served as the assistant minority leader in that body out in our home State of Illinois. He served with



distinction on the agriculture committee, the rules committee, and has been cited any number of times for his outstanding leadership and capability as a legislator.

I would like for Members to again welcome warmly for whatever few brief remarks he may choose to make at this time, our newest colleague, TOM EWING.

#### THE FUTURE BELONGS TO THOSE WITH IDEAS

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride and humility that I take my oath of office for the U.S. Congress. I am here fresh off of a campaign with an election on July 2.

The people were telling me certain things during that campaign. They said that government should help people and should not do everything for the people. It should not do what they can do for themselves, and that we cannot solve every problem and pay every bill.

I would like to say, as we look ahead, we should remember that the future belongs to those who are committed to turning ideas into action. The hopes and dreams of our children and grandchildren will depend upon our ability to make a difference.

I look forward to working very closely with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] and the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. I thank them for the courtesies which they have extended to me.

As a new Member of Congress, I realize there will be limits to what I can accomplish. However, I intend to work hard. I promised the people in my district that I would be the very best Congressman I could and attempt to be as good as my predecessor, Ed Madigan.

On behalf of the people of the 15th Congressional District in Illinois, my family, myself, I thank all very much. God bless each person, and God bless America.

#### ECONOMIC ACTION PLAN NEEDED NOW

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I finally understand how the Bush administration plans to get us out of the recession: They plan to wait it out.

Well, that is not good enough for those who are facing the threat of unemployment, those who have already lost their jobs, or those young people who are coming out of college to find that there is no place for them in an already choked job market. This past

week, we learned that the unemployment rate hit 7 percent for the first time since 1986. Last month, there were 8.7 million Americans out of work. And what is the administration telling us? Is this still just a temporary interruption—as the President calls it?

This is what we have been hearing for the past 2 years—in fact, it took the President almost that long just to admit that we were in a recession at all. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have all just spent 2 weeks at home talking with our constituents. I held office hours at shopping centers and had lunch with workers. My constituents know there is a recession, and they want us to take action.

There are few signs of recovery in Connecticut. Week after week, month after month, my constituents are losing their jobs, businesses are consolidating their operations, or closing their doors for good. Hardworking middle income people who are struggling to make ends meet in the face of skyrocketing costs for basics like health care, education, and food, are now facing the growing prospect of unemployment.

We cannot continue to sit around and wait for the recession to end; 8.7 million unemployed Americans represent more than a statistic. They are real people, paying the price every day.

Mr. Speaker, we need an administration that will wake up to the needs of average families and a Congress that will enact an economic action plan; 8.7 million Americans need our help.

#### COSPONSORS URGED FOR INCOME-DEPENDENT EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT [IDEA]

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, recently I proposed the Income-Dependent Education Assistance Act—known in short as IDEA.

Under IDEA, subsidies would be precisely targeted to all those who need them, only to those who need them, and to the extent of their need.

Thus IDEA would solve the middle-income access problem we've all been hearing about.

As you know, it would cost a ton of money to open up eligibility for Stafford loans to all students regardless of family income.

But when you turn the picture around and look at it from the IDEA perspective, the whole picture changes.

The IDEA program would want students from middle and upper income families to participate because these students stand the best chance of achieving high earnings themselves—which means that rapid repayment of their IDEA loans would provide a cross subsidy for other borrowers who are less successful.

I should emphasize that under IDEA those anticipating high incomes after school would still want to participate because they would still get a better deal than they could from alternative financing sources.

Mr. Speaker, I am seeking cosponsorships, and those interested can find more information on IDEA on page E1792 of the May 16 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### USE LEVERAGE WITH CHINA TO FREE PRISONERS

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today, as Members consider most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China, I rise to call their attention to Amnesty International's 1991 report on human rights abuses, which was released yesterday. This report is a terrible indictment of China in its treatment of those who spoke out for democratic reform there.

Hundreds of people have been arrested in connection with the 1989 protests, and they remain in prison. While the fate of thousands are unknown, we do know that thousands are in the Beijing prisons now. In North China, over 30 Roman Catholic bishops, priests, and church members have been arrested. Members of Protestant groups are also detained and harassed. Beatings and harsh treatment of detainment were commonplace at Tiananmen Square.

Because of China's trade surplus with the United States, we have an opportunity to use our leverage, to free the prisoners of conscience. Members, we can do that today by voting for conditional renewal of most-favored-nation status.

#### REJECT STRIKE INCENTIVE ACT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, there is no way to fix the Strike Incentive Act, H.R. 5; though some of my colleagues are trying desperately.

There is an amendment to try to restrict the bill to unions only—though it is doubtful that the language of this amendment provides this limitation since the terms "collective bargaining representative," "bargaining unit" and "labor organization" do not translate into "union only" under the National Labor Relations Act. And there are amendments to provide a moratorium on hiring strike replacements for a period of time after the start of a strike.

Even if H.R. 5 is amended to include only unions it discriminates against those American workers who choose to

be nonunion—it is further clarified to be special interest legislation that not only holds management hostage but it treats those workers that choose to bargain for themselves as second class citizens while giving unions a government mandated special privilege.

The other solution, to provide a moratorium, is also tremendously flawed. Seasonal industries such as beach resorts could have their business destroyed for an entire year if a strike is called at the wrong time and then they could not hire permanent replacements or even advertise for them until after the moratorium. Union officials could also abuse this system by calling a strike for the moratorium time frame, return to work before it expires, resume bargaining and then call another strike.

There is no way to fix H.R. 5. Let us reject it.

#### U.S. STANDARD OF LIVING DECLINES

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, when we go home for a break, as we have been, people tend to shake their heads as we talk about Washington, DC. Today I think is going to be one of those days where they shake their heads again, because today, as we see the very prestigious Council on Competitiveness releasing their report showing that the standard of living in the United States declined in 1990, and that of the seven industrial nations, ours has the slowest, we are taking up most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China.

□ 1240

The United States already owes more money to China than any other country except Japan. They have a terrible human rights record. They have been selling weapons to Iraq. They have even been turning their tanks on their own children.

I find it amazing when there are so many things that we should be doing at home for our own people that the administration's No. 1 cause is "We must continue to reward the People's Republic of China with all of our money and by giving them most favored nation status."

#### H.R. 5: STRIKER REPLACEMENT NOT SIGNIFICANT

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, a General Accounting Office [GAO] report released this year has several findings that contradict the claims made by the

advocates of H.R. 5, the striker replacement bill.

Proponents argue that many employers use prestrike threats of replacement to scare workers into staying on the job. The report shows that employers announced they would hire replacements before a strike began, in only 5 percent of the cases studied.

H.R. 5 supporters claim it is necessary because of the numerous workers who lose their jobs due to employers quickly using striker replacement, without allowing time for good faith negotiations.

The GAO study proves otherwise. It found that in a majority of the instances where replacements were hired, it was not done until at least 1 month after the workers had walked away from their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5 will give union workers an unfair leverage in labor negotiations, and will encourage the disruption of fair and legitimate businesses—all of this to cure a problem that was shown, in the GAO report, not to be significant in the American workplace. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week the Department of Labor announced the unemployment rate is up to 7 percent. There is little encouragement in that to those who have been laid off and are desperately looking for work. Add to that the 1.2 million long-term unemployed workers who have exhausted their benefits and must turn to public assistance programs to survive.

My hometown of Toledo, OH, with an unemployment rate of 10.7 percent, proves that once these individuals exhaust their benefits and their hopes for finding employment, they have no choice but to turn to public assistance. Welfare rolls are at an all-time high in America—4.4 million families—with the fastest rising category being those who have fallen off the unemployment rolls. To make matters worse, States are slashing benefits at a time when they are most needed.

Mr. Speaker, my family is historically democratic. And one of the important reasons is that everytime a Republican President occupied the White House, somehow my grandfather and others were put out of a blue-collar job. Though that was years ago, times really have not changed.

#### SAVE THE TIMBER INDUSTRY

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely ironic that on the day that one arm of the Federal Government is putting out a report called "Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing," another arm, the U.S. Forest Service, should be declaring a ban on harvesting live trees in the Sierra Nevada, pending a study of the California spotted owl.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have got to protect our environment and all the species therein, but this report calls for a thorough review and reform of the Endangered Species Act.

The California spotted owl is not even federally protected. This decision by the Forest Service will devastate our already burdened economies in this part of California by making unemployment worse and suffering even more grievous than it is.

I urge the Forest Service to reverse this policy, pending the thorough reform and review of the Endangered Species Act called for by this report.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S WISE DECISION TO END SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I am here with some good news.

Mr. Speaker, the President announced a few minutes ago that he is ending sanctions against South Africa. I applaud the President's decision.

South Africa has embarked on a new era of racial harmony and peace, and it is time for America to help the new South African leadership restore its economy and once again become a strong ally.

Ending the sanctions will help all South Africans, especially the black population, which suffered so greatly under the sanctions. For millions of South Africans, of all races, this is the dawning of a new era of peace and prosperity, and we Americans welcome this new era. This action fulfills the purpose of my bill, H.R. 1895, which I introduced on April 17 and is beginning the process of ending sanctions.

#### MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS TO CHINA A GRAVE MISTAKE

(Mr. SMITH of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are going to take a very, very important vote today on the floor of this House relating to most favored nation status for China.

All I can say is quite simply that voting for most-favored-nation status would bring us to the point where we are now with a country like Japan. China has the same inclinations, take



technology from the United States, take jobs from the United States, then flood the United States with imports from your country, flood them and then when they build up, like the Japanese have a huge trade surplus, try to get more. Do not turn around and give it back.

Japan forced China, forced China by telling them they were going to cut off what they had to reverse a trade surplus. We are not doing that.

On top of that, China has been known to sell technology, like Japan has just been revealed selling our technology. China, we know, has already sold our technology and is selling missiles, weapons, et cetera, in places where we do not believe it ought to be done.

Selling and giving most favored nation status to China is a huge mistake for the United States and it is another shipment of jobs overseas.

#### STRIKER REPLACEMENT BILL IS ANTISMAALL BUSINESS

(Mr. ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, proponents of H.R. 5, the striker replacement bill, claim that it would not affect most small businesses because the vast majority of them are not unionized.

In fact, this bill would have Congress grant unions both the incentive and the power to launch a huge organizing campaign aimed at small, nonunion businesses.

"Join the union and your job will be permanently protected. Don't join and you can be permanently replaced." This is the message that proponents of H.R. 5 want the U.S. Congress to send to American workers.

Small business owners cannot simply go out and hire temporaries, or get management to take the place of striking workers. If H.R. 5 becomes law, unions only need to entice a few employees onto a picket line in order to force a small business owner into an economically precarious position.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5. It is easy to say that you are for small business. But it is how you vote that really counts.

□ 1250

#### LIFTING SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA IS PREMATURE

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the President lifted economic sanctions against South Africa. His timing could not be worse. Just when sanctions are reaping their maxi-

mum benefits, he wants to remove the only modest leverage we have to bring democratic change to this troubled Nation.

The President is bending over backward to accommodate South Africa's Government. But he is not doing the same for South Africa's people. The conditions to lift sanctions have simply not been met, in letter or spirit.

The law states that sanctions cannot be lifted until all political prisoners are released. Yet hundreds continue to languish and suffer in South African jails, only because of their opposition to the most brutal form of racism the world has yet to know. And the law states that the cornerstones of apartheid must be removed. Sure, the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act have been repealed. Yet new laws will accomplish the same purposes: continued segregation and classification based on race.

Mr. Speaker, if America is to abandon its moral authority throughout the world, then we will pursue the Bush policies; if we are to continue to lead the world in its moral authority, then we should continue to keep sanctions on South Africa.

#### H.R. 5 WOULD DESTROY WORKING RELATIONSHIPS WITH SMALL EMPLOYERS

(Mr. IRELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, soon we will be asked to consider H.R. 5, striker replacement legislation. If this bill becomes law, the positive employer-employee relationships we find in most small businesses today could become a thing of the past.

H.R. 5's dual standard of protection under the law for union and nonunion employees encourages union organizing even in healthy, happy working environments.

It should not be the function of this body to provide Government-sponsored incentives for nonunion workers to join a union. But that is what H.R. 5 would do.

This bill would foster labor unrest in the small business community. It would allow unions working with just two employees to dictate to an employer the workplace policies of his or her business.

My colleagues, our Nation's 20 million small business owners and their employees deserve better than this. And they deserve more than lip service from the U.S. Congress. I urge you to join me in taking a stand against H.R. 5, and for our Nation's entrepreneurs.

Remember, it is easy to say you are for small business. But it is how you vote that really counts.

#### IRS AGENTS ARE TAUGHT HOW TO USE SAUNAS, HOT BATHS; AMERICAN TAXPAYERS GET THE SHAFT

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, for 2 years now legislation has been introduced which would require the IRS to provide a training program for their agents to minimize the abuse of the American taxpayers. For 2 years the IRS has stone-cold killed it.

I will quote why: They said:

We in the IRS do not need an official law mandating that program, because we already do it.

Listen to how they do it: They just spent \$150,000, \$2,000 per agent, at a luxury resort in West Virginia. They taught IRS agents how to take saunas, hot baths, how to use hot tubs, how to swim real well, and to tone their bodies.

What a joke, folks.

But the truth is the laugh is on the American taxpayer. While the IRS is enjoying hot tub saunas and facials, the American taxpayers keep getting the shaft.

The tragedy of it all is Congress keeps turning the screw. What is the next program going to be? How about Disneyland, folks? Or give them some money so they can go to Hawaii. Maybe they will stop ripping off the American taxpayer.

#### H.R. 5 WILL HURT SMALL-BUSINESS WORKERS

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the striker replacement bill is designed to stop business owners from permanently replacing workers who walk off the job for more money, or better benefits, or other economic reasons.

Supporters of H.R. 5 want to cast this as a David and Goliath type issue, with poor union workers as David and huge corporations as Goliath.

They are simply ignoring the very real, very damaging impact the bill would have on our Nation's smaller firms—and on those firms' nonunion employees.

This bill is bad for small business. What's at stake is not simply who has the upper hand in labor negotiations between the AFL-CIO and corporate America.

What's at stake is American jobs generated by the 20 million small businesses in every district in the country.

My colleagues, let us not sell out small-business interests to big-labor bosses. Vote against H.R. 5.

It is time to support small business with your vote.

# SUPPORT EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the extension of funding for child abuse prevention and treatment programs. Too often these days children are relegated to a far corner of our country's conscience. Each year there are over 2 million cases of child abuse reported. The actual number is much higher. It is one of the most heartbreaking crimes in our Nation.

Child abusers are likely to be a member of the child's immediate family or a family acquaintance. This often makes it too hard for abused children to be identified, too hard for a child to admit to abuse and too hard to prove the case in a court of law.

We must do all we can to help State and local officials identify and treat abused children and prosecute child abusers. The program is being reauthorized in this bill to instruct teachers, doctors, and social workers how to identify and treat abused children and support the law enforcement community in finding new methods to accurately and effectively prosecute child abusers.

Mr. Speaker, the next frontier in fighting child abuse is the challenge of its prevention. Identifying the many causes of child abuse will help communities reach out to families and parents under pressure situations where the chances of child abuse are great and reach out to children to give them the courage to report abuse and to find help.

Mr. Speaker, fighting child abuse now may help these victims avoid mental illness, failure in school, unemployment, and even the cycle of abuse passed down from generation to generation. The seriousness of this problem is evident and the need for these programs is great.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2720.

## MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR CHINA

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this is an important day for the people of China. We will have the opportunity this afternoon to tie China's most-favored-nation trade status with the United States to progress on human rights. I believe that it is absolutely essential that the United States Congress support the Pelosi bill to place conditions on the renewal of MFN status for the People's Republic of China and require

China to make significant progress in the area of human rights before receiving MFN status next year.

The People's Republic of China continues to imprison people for expressing democratic ideals, for exercising their religious beliefs and for advocating human rights. Two more human rights advocates were arrested in April and another Catholic bishop in June.

I have a picture with me of another Catholic bishop, Joseph Fan Xueyin. Bishop Fan is 83 years old. He was imprisoned for 21 years between 1958 and 1979 for refusing to renounce his ties with the Roman Catholic Church. Since then he was arrested again in 1981 and sentenced to reform through labor, despite the fact that he was 73 years old at the time. In 1987, he was transferred to house arrest, thanks to the intervention of Catholic Bishop Sin of Manila, not to the kindness of Chinese authorities.

Since being placed under house arrest, Bishop Fan has been shipped against his will from place to place to prevent him for exerting positive influence over local Catholic churches. He is in poor health, and unless pressure is applied to persuade the Chinese Government to release him, he will almost certainly die under detention.

The Pelosi bill which will be considered today would require that the Chinese Government make significant progress in ending religious persecution if China is to receive MFN status next year. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this bill for the sake of Bishop Fan and thousands of others who are suffering unjustly in the People's Republic of China.

## WOMEN HOLD IMPORTANT ROLES IN AGRICULTURE

(Ms. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest misconceptions about agriculture is that it is a field where only men are involved. In reality, women hold important roles in agriculture in ever increasing numbers.

Over the years, more women have entered farming on their own and farm women spouses have more frequently been considered cooperators with their husbands.

In fact, the 1987 Census of Agriculture identified 132,000 farms whose operators or senior partners were women. This represented over 6 percent of all farms and was an increase of 10,000 in 5 years, at a time when the overall number of farms was falling.

In addition to farming, women have been involved in agriculture in much broader ways such as research and development, food exporting, lobbying, and holding top positions in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, because these women deserve recognition, several Members and I are today introducing legislation to designate March 19, 1992, as "National Women in Agriculture Day." This day will focus the public's attention on the significant and too often overlooked role women play in our Nation's agricultural system.

## LABOR LAW HISTORY LESSON

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the striker replacement bill want to overturn a key principle that has been in our labor law for 50 years. History suggests this might not be a very bright idea.

Right now, there is a balance in labor-management relations: Employees have the right to strike, but employers have the right to try to continue operations by hiring permanent replacements.

If we ban even the possibility of hiring permanent replacements, we will destroy this delicate balance. The result will be a wave of strikes and economic disruptions on a large scale.

Now, the last time we had such an imbalance in labor-management relations was during the 1940's. There were bitter and violent strikes across the country.

The public responded to that situation by throwing out the Democrat majority in Congress and electing a Republican Congress for the first time since the New Deal. This Republican Conference then passed the Taft-Hartley Act restoring the balance.

The historical lesson is clear: If we pass H.R. 5, we will soon have an outraged public on our hands and we will have to pass another bill to correct our mistake.

Mr. Speaker, let us save ourselves the trouble and reject H.R. 5.

## NRA BEGINS DRIVE TO STALL CRIME BILL WHILE CARNAGE CONTINUES

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, how ironic it is that our morning headlines carry these two headlines:

"Stray Bullet and Gun Fight Kills Mother With Three in Car," and a few pages over, "NRA Begins Drive To Stall Crime Bill."

Mr. Speaker, we see once again the unlimited zeal of the NRA. The gun lobby has now decided to work for the defeat of the entire crime bill. The NRA lost the Brady bill votes in the House and the Senate fair and square, so now they seek to kill the whole bill by filibuster.



How can the NRA say with a straight face that they are interested in stopping the violent crime that plagues our Nation when they are seeking to kill a bill that both the President and the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, say is essential to curbing crime?

Mr. Speaker, the senseless killing of the young mother, possibly with a semiautomatic weapon, within the sight of the Capitol dome, is another glaring example of why we must persevere against this opposition. How many more mothers must die? How many more children must be left motherless before we resist the NRA?

My colleagues, we must enact a sensible waiting period on handguns and do something to curb the use of weapons of mass destruction. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate will flank the NRA's Maginot Line and pass legislation to prevent crime and stop the carnage.

#### WORLD GRATEFUL AS COOLER HEADS PREVENT BALKANIZATION IN THE BALKANS

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have been informed that the last phase of the temporary peace sought in Yugoslavia by the European Community occurred today when the parliament of Slovenia overwhelmingly voted to accept the European Community's proposal. Slovenia's decision was most vital. Prior to the vote President Kucan is reported to have pointed out to his parliament that their vote would mean either peace or war, and President Kucan recommended peace. The world is grateful.

Mr. Speaker, these last 3 weeks have been very difficult throughout all of the republics in Yugoslavia. Let us pray that every effort now will be made over these next 3 months to establish a federal government that will allow all six republics to live and work together, that will prevent further loss of life, that will create improvement for the rights of all of their citizens for a national, free, fair, and multiparty election and will provide the means for a thriving economy. Hopefully cooler heads will continue to prevail and the return of the balkanization in the Balkans will not occur.

#### AMERICA'S LIBRARIES NEED HELP

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive of anything more barren, more desolate, more sterile, more empty, and more unhappy than an America without books, an America

without libraries, and an America without information. That is a possibility unless we move quickly to strengthen America's libraries, both the free public libraries as well as school-related libraries.

Right here in Washington the White House Conference on Library and Information Services is meeting and it will chart, in its week of activity, the blueprint for libraries for the next decade, which takes us into the next century. I am very proud that two persons from my district are delegates to that White House Conference: Harriet Henderson, who is the director of the Louisville Free Public Library system, and Linda Hall Perkins, who is a 24-year librarian in the Jefferson County school system.

I wish these delegates, the full Kentucky delegation, and the White House Conference every success in their important task of helping America's libraries.

#### H.R. 5 WOULD TURN LABOR NEGOTIATIONS INTO RUSSIAN ROULETTE

(Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, after 50 years of labor law precedent, labor unions recently decided that allowing management to offer permanent employment to replace workers who strike for purely economic reasons is somehow inherently wrong.

Their proposed solution—titled H.R. 5—would aim a loaded gun squarely between the the eyes of our Nation's small business owners.

Labor unions apparently think that workers deserve the right to strike without consequence, while employers should have no rights at all to keep their businesses running during employee work actions, no matter why these workers decide to strike.

It is easy for Members of Congress to demagogue and say that they are for small business, economic opportunity, and the creation of new jobs. But it is how they vote that really counts. Do not vote to turn labor negotiations into a form of Russian roulette for our Nation's businesses. Vote against H.R. 5.

#### MFN FOR CHINA MAKES NO SENSE

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has a blind spot on China. His policy is: See no evil, hear no evil.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand his grand China bargain. In exchange for China repressing its own people, working against our policy in Cambodia,

and selling \$758 million in weapons to countries like Syria, we give them trade advantages, most-favored-nation status. Mr. Speaker, that is some bargain.

The President's policy on China makes no sense. It is wrong, wrong, wrong. Mr. Speaker, how can we look at democratic forces in Europe with a straight face when we reward the butchers of Beijing?

Mr. Speaker, today we are debating most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China. Two years ago, the renewal of this privilege was thought of as an imperative measure to strengthen the ties between our country and China. Since this time, however, the People's Republic of China has demonstrated a wanton disregard for human rights and have sold arms to potentially dangerous countries.

We can't possibly ignore the memorable scenes of the prodemocracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square. We can't ignore the fact that China sold approximately \$780 million of arms throughout the world in 1989; a large percentage of these arms were sold to countries such as Syria and Pakistan. Because we have granted them the MFN status, we are encouraging human rights abuses and the threat of terrorism worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to renew MFN status to China we must grant such status with certain conditions. If we allow China the MFN privilege without conditions, we will be voting against the Judeo-Christian belief of the dignity of man as espoused by our Founding Fathers. If we fail to place these conditions on China we will see numerous human rights violations persisting in the future, and those images of Tiananmen Square, indelibly printed in our memories, will be a part of reality once again. We cannot allow this to happen. The citizens of China have suffered enough.

#### PROTECT SMALL BUSINESSES AND AMERICAN JOBS—VOTE AGAINST H.R. 5

(Mr. RAMSTAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, proponents of H.R. 5, the striker replacement bill, argue that it would not adversely affect small businesses or jobs. This claim needs scrutiny.

Small businesses generate more than 67 percent of all new jobs in the United States. American small businesses set the standard for the rest of the world in terms of creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurial spirit. The striker replacement bill is a direct threat to this vital sector of our economy.

The workers of this country rightfully deserve the powerful economic tool of organized strikes. This is necessary to guarantee that workers possess ample bargaining power in disputes with their employers.

But the delicate balance of bargaining strength now existing between labor and management should be maintained.

H.R. 5 would upset this balance and force employers to go out of business and jobs to be lost.

To protect small businesses, American jobs, and the economy, vote "no" on H.R. 5 when it comes to the House floor.

#### CONDITIONAL RENEWAL OF MFN FOR CHINA

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, since renewal of most-favored-nation status last year, we have seen no significant improvement in China's human rights record. It is a record which remains far short of internationally recognized standards. Arrests, trials, and incarceration of dissidents continue, as does official restriction on religious freedom. The Government of China has refused to issue a list of those detained, arrested, tried, or released. China's policy of repression instituted in 1988 continues in 1991.

More recently, another form of repression has surfaced. Official Government documents revealed by Asia Watch confirm the use of prison labor under China's gulag system to produce goods for export. These documents clearly indicate that hard currency is being earned in export trade through prison manufactures.

Mr. Speaker, unconditional extension of most-favored-nation status would send the wrong message to the Chinese rulers—that they are allowed to continue their systematic repression and brutality at no cost. Those Members of Congress who, like myself, support the Pelosi bill—H.R. 2212—are not advocating for a complete withdrawal of this privilege. My support for this bill is based on the belief that political liberalization and economic liberalization are not independent of each other.

Political reform, hence improved human rights, is the key to economic reform as it provides the internal stability required to encourage international trade and investment.

□ 1310

#### PROHIBIT POSTAL BONUSES WHILE SERVICE OPERATES IN THE RED

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, once again we have received shocking news about the wasteful way the Federal Government is spending money. Yesterday it was reported in newspapers around the Nation that the Postal Service has given bonuses to nearly all its executives, at a time the Service has been losing huge amounts of

money. These losses have had to be made up by the taxpayers. Yet Postmaster General Frank, instead of being embarrassed about this, has tried to defend it.

Mr. Speaker, only our Federal Government would give bonuses totaling \$20 million to executives of an agency that lost \$1.4 billion over the 3 years these bonuses were being given.

This could not happen in the private sector. In the real world, businesses cannot spend money that they do not have if they want to stay in business, and yet we always do that in Washington.

We need to demand that the Postal Service operate more like a private business. If we do not, the people will continue to lose faith in the entire Federal Government. I am sure that the Congress is too liberal to do this, but also we should pass a law prohibiting bonuses to any Postal Service executives unless and until the Postal Service begins to operate in the black.

Mr. Speaker, most of the problems of this Nation could be solved if we could give our people much less government and much more freedom and free enterprise.

#### THE IMPORTATION OF PEANUTS IS A BLOW TO OUR FARMERS

(Mr. RAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed and concerned with the administration's decision to allow the importation of 100 million pounds of peanuts into this country by the end of this month, in the next 21 days.

Mr. Speaker, this packet of Georgia peanuts is grown under safe conditions, having been inspected by State and Federal agencies, and is not contaminated. But I am very skeptical about the quality of the 100 million pounds of peanuts that will be packaged in the next few weeks and sold to American consumers.

It is crucial that we do the utmost to protect the health of the American consumer and the reputation of the American grower by carefully monitoring the quality of every peanut brought into this country. We do not know what condition those peanuts were grown under. Perhaps they will have aflatoxin and stripe and clump viruses, which affect peanuts grown in many foreign countries and are not cared about in those countries by the producers nor the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have a shortage of peanuts in the United States, and I am very disappointed in the President's action.

#### MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS TO COMMUNIST CHINA? NO WAY

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today this Congress will vote on most-favored-nation status for the communist regime in Beijing. We are asked to vote on "business as usual" with a regime that murders its people, that commits genocide in Tibet, and that sells missiles and nuclear technology to Third World despots; to a regime with one of the worst human rights records on the planet. We are asked to vote for "business as usual" with this gang of Communist thugs. No way.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to offer it, if we offer most-favored-nation status, not to the people of China but to this murderous regime. No way.

#### WITH FRIENDS LIKE THIS, WHO NEEDS ENEMIES

(Mr. APPELGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to vote on whether or not to give most-favored-nation status to Communist China. Well, folks, how about the United States of America getting consideration for having most-favored-nation status, particularly from countries like Kuwait? They should be extending most-favored-nation status to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, America spent over 300 American lives, our young people, freeing Kuwait, and we spent over \$50 to \$60 billion of American taxpayer money to free Kuwait. Then they are giving their contracts to rebuild Kuwait to other countries of the world.

Why do we not get most-favored-nation status? The first contract they sold, they got 25,000 tons of raw steel from Japan and Venezuela. What the hell did Japan and Venezuela do in that war? They did nothing.

Now Kuwait is going to give a \$2 billion contract to buy planes, but not to Boeing or any other United States firm. They are going to give it to France Airbus.

Mr. Speaker, where is the loyalty? At least where is the debt that they owe us? With friends like that, the United States sure as hell does not need any more enemies.

#### CONGRESS DEMANDS INFORMATION ABOUT COSTS OF AIR FORCE ONE

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, 7 months ago I sent a request



to the General Accounting Office, the GAO, to conduct a review of the expenses of flying Air Force One around the country. I was interested especially in where they flew, between public and political events, and how the costs were allocated. I was interested especially, because we now have this flying Taj Mahal, the big 747, to fly the President and the White House across America. And fly it does, all the time.

Who is paying the cost? How do they allocate the cost between public events and political events?

Mr. Speaker, 7 months later I am told by the GAO that the White House will not provide the information. "This information is not available to us. The White House is stonewalling."

Mr. Speaker, what an arrogant bunch of people. They do not have the right to withhold that information. That information ought to be available to those of us in Congress, and we are going to make sure it is available, following every possible approach, insisting they disclose the information about the cost of Air Force One.

A message to the White House is, we are not going to quit. We want that information, we demand that information, we have a right to it, and you are going to provide it.

#### MEMBERS WHO FLY IN GLASS PLANES SHOULD NOT THROW STONES

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me respond briefly to my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], who just spoke about the travel of the White House and the attendant costs of the aircraft that are assigned to the White House.

Let me just say if we are going to continue to have this partisan attack on the President, on the Republican side, we are going to start categorizing and listing expenses by Members of Congress and travel, not only in this country, but around the world, on Government aircraft.

I would simply say to my friend, that this President has just come off a war in which he won a ground war against a very heavily armed enemy in 100 hours. And he flies a big plane.

If you gave aircraft to Congress based on their achievements over the last 10 or 12 months, we would all be flying in Piper Cubs, with about 15 Members assigned to each one.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the other side of the aisle is going to have to realize if they are going to continue to talk about costs of administration aircraft, it is only right that we begin to categorize and list the expenses of aircraft used by House Members.

□ 1320

#### UNITED STATES SHOULD CONTINUE SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. MRAZEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to lift our sanctions against South Africa. Our national interests and certainly those of the vast majority of people of South Africa are best served by the continuation of those sanctions. We should be encouraged by the positive changes that have taken place in recent years, but there is still a long uphill battle to try to help bring justice to that troubled nation.

On the same day that headlines proclaimed President Bush's intent to lift sanctions against South Africa, Amnesty International released its annual human rights report. It notes that in 1990, more than 1,500 critics and opponents of the government were detained without charge or trial for up to 6 months at a time.

Although the administration is apparently satisfied on the issue of political prisoners, Amnesty International estimates that many political prisoners remain incarcerated in South Africa. The African National Congress estimates that number at nearly 1,000 individuals.

After decades of frustration, the African National Congress is set to begin negotiations with the white minority government in the next few months. We should not prejudice those negotiations. We should not strengthen the hand of the minority government. We should not give the minority government reason to believe that the United States commitment to the abolition of apartheid is wavering in any way. We should not lift the sanctions at this time.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1782

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1782.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### RELATING TO MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 189

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution, general debate in the House on the

subject of most-favored-nation treatment for the People's Republic of China shall be in order for a period for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. All points of order against consideration are waived with respect to each of the three measures specified in sections 2, 4, and 5.

SEC. 2. After general debate it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 263) disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Solomon of New York and Representative Rostenkowski of Illinois or their designees. Pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion.

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not apply to any other joint resolution disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation treatment of the People's Republic of China for the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Second Congress.

SEC. 4. After disposition of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 263) it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2212) regarding the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes. The bill shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendments recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, which shall be considered en bloc and which shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question, and on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. After disposition of the bill (H.R. 2212) it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 174) concerning relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for one hour, with thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendments recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the concurrent resolution, which shall be considered en bloc and which shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question, and on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 189 provides for the consideration of three

matters relating to extension of most-favored-nation trade status with the People's Republic of China. Mr. Speaker, the rule providing for the consideration of these three measures provides the House ample opportunity to express its will on the current and future trading status of the United States with the PRC and I rise in strong support of the resolution recommended to the House by the Committee on Rules.

House Resolution 189 provides for 1 hour of general debate on the general topic of most-favored-nation treatment for the People's Republic of China, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Further debate time, which will specifically address the three measures made in order for consideration in the rule, is provided and all points of order against the consideration of those measures are waived by the rule.

Mr. Speaker, a brief history of most-favored-nation trade, prior to my explanation of the rule, is in order. Beginning in 1951, with the exception of Yugoslavia, MFN status was withdrawn from all Communist nonmarket countries. In 1960, Poland's MFN status was restored by Presidential directive. In 1974, the Congress adopted the Jackson-Vanik amendment as title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 and which authorized the President to waive the freedom of emigration requirements of the act and grant MFN status to a nonmarket economy country if he determines that such action would substantially promote the objectives of freedom of emigration. The President's waiver authority under title IV expires on July 3 of each year, but may be extended on an annual basis upon Presidential determination unless disapproved by Congress within 60 calendar days after July 3.

Most-favored-nation was first granted to the People's Republic of China on February 1, 1980 and has been renewed annually on the basis of a Presidential waiver. Since then, these annual waivers had been noncontroversial; however, on June 3, 1989, the events in Tiananmen Square changed the view of the American people toward those leaders in China who were responsible for the massacre of the peaceful students and workers who were gathered there to call for democracy in China.

The three measures made in order in House Resolution 189 all relate to the status of trade between the United States and the People's Republic of China. The first, House Joint Resolution 263, is a resolution disapproving extension of MFN status to China as recommended by the President on May 29, 1991, and takes the form set out in the Trade Act of 1974. Under the 1974 Trade Act, House Joint Resolution 263 is a privileged resolution, but the Committee on Rules has recommended that it be considered under a rule in order

to allow the House the opportunity to consider other related matters.

The second matter made in order in the rule, H.R. 2212, seeks to establish a number of preconditions which must be met by the Government of the People's Republic of China before the President may recommend continuation of MFN status in 1992. The final matter, House Concurrent Resolution 174, expresses the sense of the Congress that some foreign policy actions on the part of the Government of China will have serious negative consequences for United States-China relations, in particular placing in jeopardy the access of Chinese products to the United States market through MFN status.

Section 2 of House Resolution 189 provides for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 263, the resolution of disapproval, under procedures similar to those provided for in sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974. Therefore, the rule precludes any amendment to the resolution, allowing only for an up-or-down vote and no motion to recommit. The rule, however, provides only 1 hour of debate on the joint resolution rather than the 20 hours provided for in the statute. The debate time is to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. SOLOMON, of New York, the author of the resolution, and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 263 was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and while there was no clear majority to report the resolution favorably, the committee reported the resolution on June 26 without recommendation in order to offer the entire House the opportunity to vote on the resolution of disapproval.

Under the Trade Act of 1974, privilege is extended to only one resolution of disapproval per session of Congress. Consequently, section 3 of House Resolution 189 provides that the expedited consideration procedures found in sections 152 and 153 shall not apply to any other joint resolution of disapproval relating to the People's Republic of China during the remainder of this session of the 102d Congress.

Section 4 of House Resolution 189 provides that after the House has disposed of the Solomon resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House H.R. 2212. H.R. 2212 was reported, with amendments, favorably from the Committee on Ways and Means on June 26. The rule provides that H.R. 2212 shall be debatable for 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the committee amendments. Those amendments shall be considered en bloc and are not, under the rule, subject to a demand for a division of the question. Finally, section 4 provides

that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Section 5 provides that after the disposition of H.R. 2212, it shall be in order to consider in the House the House Concurrent Resolution 174 which was reported favorably on June 26 from the Committee on Ways and Means and from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with amendments. The rule provides that House Concurrent Resolution 174 shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The rule provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the Foreign Affairs Committee amendments, that they shall be considered en bloc and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question. Finally, section 5 provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

Mr. Speaker, given the level of controversy associated with the President's decision to extend most-favored-nation trading status to the People's Republic of China for another year, the Committee on Rules has fashioned a rule which will allow all sides of this issue an opportunity to fully express their views on the subject. For those who favor an immediate end to MFN for China, or for those who favor leveraged pressure on the Government of China to improve conditions in that country, the rule provides an option. In addition, the rule allows the House the opportunity to further make its view known regarding the issue of China's action relating to proliferation of nuclear and missile technology. Mr. Speaker, given the enormous complexity of our Nation's relationship to the People's Republic of China, I believe this rule will offer the House ample opportunity to express its will regarding such a relationship in the coming months and years. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that the House may proceed to the consideration of these most important matters.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition, perhaps I should say non-support, of the rule.

I am troubled by the fact that a request by the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], that an open rule be granted on H.R. 2212, the Pelosi bill,



was not granted by the Committee on Rules. The practical effect of this rule is to deny an opportunity for our colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER], to offer his amendment that would establish a code of conduct for U.S. businesses operating in China similar to the Sullivan principles that are in effect in South Africa today. I would like to have had the opportunity to discuss and vote on that amendment.

Having said all of that though, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the business of the House has to go on. I would have preferred an open rule, but I shall not ask for a recorded vote on this one since we are about to go into a protracted 5-hour debate.

This rule will permit the House to work its will on the important question of whether or not to renew most-favored-nation trade status for the People's Republic of China. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has indicated, this is a modified closed rule that provides for the consideration of three legislative initiatives on this important issue.

After 1 hour of general debate, it shall be in order to consider for 1 hour Joint Resolution 263, that I and 16 other Members have introduced. House Joint Resolution 263 would deny, and I repeat, deny, the administration's request for a 1-year extension of China's MFN status. China's present status would thus be terminated upon the enactment of this joint resolution.

Following a vote on the Solomon resolution, it shall then be in order to consider for 2 hours H.R. 2212, a bill that was introduced by our colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI]. Under the terms of her bill, China's present MFN status would be renewed for 1991, but it will be terminated in 1992 if several conditions primarily concerned with human rights issues are not met by next June.

Following the 2-hour debate on that bill, there will be a vote on the several amendments to the bill that were adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means. These amendments will be considered en bloc, and they will not be subject to amendment or division. In other words, we have to cast one vote on all four of those amendments. Then, depending on how the recommittal motion goes, there will be a vote on final passage on H.R. 2212.

Finally, I should advise my colleagues that the rule also makes in order consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 174, a sense-of-Congress resolution offered by our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ]. His resolution concerns Chinese participation in the various non-proliferation regimes regulating international transfers of nuclear technology, guided missiles, and the like. I am not sure if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] is going to offer his

resolution. But, nevertheless, the rule does provide for it.

Just to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred an open amendment process on the Pelosi bill, but I do believe that this rule provides for an adequate and orderly process in dealing with this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, for my part, I obviously plan to support my own resolution of disapproval, and I also plan on voting for the Pelosi bill, which I was pleased to cosponsor with more than 100 other Members from all points on the political spectrum, conservative, liberal, and everywhere else in the middle.

Indeed, the resolution of disapproval and H.R. 2212, the Pelosi bill, can be seen as being complementary to each other. The resolution of disapproval applies to China's MFN status this year and would terminate that status as of right now. The Pelosi bill applies to China's MFN status next year, and it sets the conditions that would have to be met before MFN could be renewed or restarted next year.

Members can, in good conscience, support both the resolution of disapproval and the Pelosi bill. I hope many Members will, as I will. We need as large a vote as possible on both of these bills in order to send the proper message to Beijing. And, believe me, passage of both of these bills will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when China seemed to be leading the way toward reform in the Communist bloc. There was a time when the Chinese leadership seemed to recognize the nature of the economic and social problems that that country was facing. But what seemed to be fact has, in truth, been exposed as an illusion.

The events in Europe and elsewhere have left China completely in the dust. The true reforms and the sweeping changes that have happened in the rest of the Communist world have exposed the Chinese policies and reform efforts as being pathetic, half hearted, and meaningless by comparison.

It is now China that is bringing up the rear. It is in China that a discredited Communist dictatorship insists on clinging to power by sole virtue of having all the guns. It is in China where this regime is fundamentally illegitimate. And it is China that we help propped up with MFN, and that is wrong.

□ 1440

That is wrong. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] said it well in testimony before the Committee on Rules yesterday. She said that The Chinese leadership hates our democracy; it hates our capitalism; and it hates our ideas about freedom; but it loves our money. I repeat: It loves our money.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the MFN gravy train for China should stop, and it should stop now. If MFN is to be re-

newed at all, it should be with conditions and requirements that speak to the needs of the Chinese people, human rights.

I hope that both the resolution of disapproval and the bill of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will pass overwhelmingly in this House. I urge every Member to vote for both of these pieces of legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPELEGATE].

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule. However, I do want to make a statement with regard to the situation which is facing Members.

To give most-favored-nation status to China, which is a Communist country, is a most foolish notion. Therefore, I say to President Bush in his consideration of this, "No, no, a thousand times no."

It is an insult to the American veterans to say to them, now that they have fought and sacrificed for the very principles that are being denied other people in the world, we have had 1¼ million people who have died since the beginning of this country, defending freedoms, we have had millions who have been maimed and have been disabled, and now we are going to turn around and say that it is OK if we recognize a country that denies free speech, that denies freedom of the press, that denies freedom of religion, denies all human rights. That we as a nation, we are going to recognize another nation that strips its people of everything as we know it in this country.

The President of the United States says that it is just, and it is moral. I do not know what book he is reading, but I think he better go back to the library.

When Nicaragua abused those very same principles that we are talking about now, these very same principles that Americans have fought for, we cut them off. We stopped trade with Nicaragua. We took care of them completely, and now all of a sudden we are saying to China that it is all right, this godless society, it is OK if they abuse their people.

American veterans and American workers are going to lose their jobs. Listen, they are going to lose their jobs to slave labor-made products. People who are paid 50 cents a day, and that may be high, I do not know. They do not even have a minimum wage over there. If Members do not think this is true, just ask the American veterans, and the American workers what we think about most-favored-nation status.

If it is going to be China now, who is it going to be next? Are we going to give it to Hussein in Iraq? Are we going to give it to Qadhafi in Libya? How about Fidel Castro down in Cuba? Why do we not just give him most-favored-

nation status and recognize the same things they are doing in Communist China? Why do we not just free Noreiga and send him back to Panama? Then we can give it to them. What is the difference?

China, of course, is not all Communist, apparently. They are employing some of the free enterprise tactics that they use in the United States. They are hiring a public relations firm. They have hired Hill & Knowlton, one of the biggest PR firms in the United States and in the world, as a matter of fact, and paying them \$150,000 a month. What for? To lobby Congress. They are paying an American PR firm to lobby Congress and, in fact, have threatened Congressmen by saying that if they do not vote for them, China is not going to maybe do business in their district anymore.

I say that we better take another look at this. I think it is foolish, and I think that we better get our priorities straightened around in a hurry and give our loyalty to where it belongs.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the two amendments that we will be voting on in the House today. We are discussing today most-favored-nation status, not for the Chinese people. We are discussing most-favored-nation status for the Chinese regime. We are going to decide today whether this House will put itself on record as to whether we are on the side of the Chinese people, the people who long for a decent life and long for democracy, or whether we will be on the side of their oppressors. Are we on the side of the reformers or the oppressors? Are we on the side of the democratic activists or on the side of the hardened Communists?

In the past, we had to play China off against the Soviet Union. It is what we call realpolitik. That is what we had to do in the past in order to preserve the peace. There was a legitimate concern that the Soviet Union might threaten our national interest, and indeed, violate the peace and drag the world into a new Armageddon. Those days have passed. The Soviet Union is in total disarray. There is no longer an excuse for the United States to be siding with a dictatorship at a time when we no longer have to play that dictatorship off against the Soviet Union.

Also during that time period, there was a supposed evolution going on in China. Today, we see that evolution, that so-called evolution, unmasked, and we see the tyranny that remains in the blood-stained streets of Tiananmen Square.

The situation is wholly different. We no longer have the Soviet Union for an excuse, and we can no longer use the evolution toward democracy as an excuse for dealing with the Communist

regime that controls the mainland of China. The current Communist regime murders its own people. It commits genocide in Tibet. It tortures and jails and executes democratic student reformers. It sells missiles and nuclear technology to Third World despots. What message are we going to send that regime today? Are we going to send it the message that those things do not make any difference? Are we going to send a message to the people of China that we are on the side of their oppressors?

I think that it is time for the United States to stand for what this country's principles are all about. That is, we side with the people, and we side with freedom over despotism. There is another China. There is a freer China. There is nothing that we can do today that would send a better signal to the people of China and to the Communist regime in China than to recognize what is going on in the freer China at the same time that we recognize what is going on in the totalitarian China in the mainland. Not only should we look at the freer China and say that these are the people we identify with, and deny most-favored-nation status to Communist China, but we should recognize that progress in the democratic reform in Taiwan.

We could take steps, for example, to ensure that the Republic of China is part of GATT, part of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. In fact, we could even suggest that China regain its seat at the United Nations, or have a full embassy in Washington, DC. These are steps that we could take that would gain the attention of the Communist thugs in Beijing immediately. However, for those who say we must give most-favored-nation status to China, we do not hear this as an alternative. The Communist dictators in Beijing must be sent a message.

□ 1350

The people in mainland China must be sent a message as well that we are on their side and that those tyrants in Beijing will pay for their crimes. In the long run, the regime in Beijing will pass, just as every other despotic regime in history has passed.

The surge of freedom that is sweeping through other Communist States will not be reversed on Communist China's doorsteps. When that day comes, when freedom does, indeed, win the day in China, we will be left to explain why we were doing business as usual with their tyrants at a time when it counted.

Business as usual with Communist thugs? No way.

Business as usual with a regime that murders its own people, commits unspeakable genocide in Tibet, that sells missiles and nuclear technology to the Third World? No way. No most-favored-nation status for China.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today may be most-favored-nation trade time for China, but in my opinion it is once again most-foolish-nation trade time for America.

Everybody in this body knows that China gunned down their own students seeking freedom in Tiananmen Square, but how many here realize that just 2 weeks ago China threatened unless they get most-favored-nation trade status, they threatened to stop buying jet planes from the Boeing Co. Think about it. They made a demand.

Now, that demand did not hit hard enough. So guess what? They wised up. China bought the best Washington lobby they could find at \$175,000 a month. Because why not, folks? Everybody does it. If you want something from Congress, you buy a top lobbyist and they get the votes. Stone cold simple. You know it and I know it.

What is even worse than that, Mr. Speaker, is that many of the top political names that we have known over the past and many of the top staffers of these powerful committees, as soon as they are out of Government life they go on the payroll of these foreign countries. They are the same lobbyists who once had to write those laws. They are so powerful, in my opinion, it is an underground government that runs our own Congress.

But do you know what? What really bothers me is while we are in here today debating egg rolls, China keeps steamrolling over the American worker. Their trade surplus last year was \$10 billion, Mr. Speaker, second only to Japan.

Now, I want to ask you a question. How many Chinese workers at 17 cents an hour are going to buy a Chevrolet made in my district?

How many American companies are going to move overseas and hire people at 25 cents an hour with no OSHA, no EPA, no workmen's compensation?

I say we should start exporting some of these staffers, some of these powerful committee people, some of our politicians to China and let them keep their trade status to themselves.

I think today it is appropriate to quote a most famous Chinese citizen, Confucius. Confucius says that when those who fail to look after their own marbles, they put in danger and in fact lose their own.

I am wondering today if Congress has any marbles left. Maybe Confucius might work on this Congress. I think what really works on this Congress is lobbyists. I think there should be a law that there should be no foreign lobbies allowed in the United States of America, and the only lobbies allowed are those which represent absolutely the interests of the American people. That is not a tough law.



Finally, on these free traders, let me say one last thing, Mr. Speaker. While we have all this free trade, let me tell you what we have. We have free bankruptcy, free economic collapse, and in about 5 years, try to buy a meal with your Toyota, and try to eat your Suzuki.

Think about it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule because it again waives the 3-day layover rule to the detriment of the legislative process.

While I am concerned about the specifics of this rule, I will support the resolution disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation [MFN] status for China.

Today, partisan politics and party loyalty take a back seat to moral convictions.

On this issue, I repeatedly come to the following conclusion: We can either continue sticking our head in the sand, or we can be strong defenders of freedom and fairness.

I prefer to come out swinging.

Last week, America celebrated her 215th birthday. Between the barbecues and the parades, I was asked to express my thoughts about this Nation's accomplishments and our goals for the future.

I chose to quote Abraham Lincoln who said our—

Declaration of Independence \* \* \* gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world, for all future time. It gave promise to that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all would have an equal chance.

Sadly it appears to me that extending MFN status to China is a sign that instead of working for hope, we're turning our back on those ideals and beliefs that we hold dear—all in the name of expanding our economic interests.

That is not why I came to Congress.

Each year, China promises to do better when it comes to human rights abuses. But each year, the promises get shallower and more unbelievable.

China is still a nation where peaceful, freedom-seeking demonstrators either disappear, or face judges and juries that are stacked against them.

China also promises to promote fair trade with our Nation.

But in the last year, China has made it tougher for American products to reach Chinese markets.

While imports from China have increased 27 percent, exports to China have decreased by 17 percent. Last year, our trade imbalance with China increased to \$10.4 billion.

And, finally, China promises to stop promoting pain and terror in other nations. But in the last year, nuclear

missile launchers have been sent to Pakistan and negotiations are underway for the delivery of missiles to this unstable nation.

China has also sent chemicals to Iraq which have been used to make nerve gas, missile fuel, and nuclear weapons.

No more promises, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to vote against MFN status for China.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, first things first. No one here today will argue that in terms of domestic policy and basic human rights within the People's Republic of China do not meet our standards that we too often take for granted in the United States.

And, I agree that we must keep working to implement a common sense and practical policy and strategy that will help urge and even force the Chinese Government to pursue and adopt meaningful reforms. In this regard, I appreciate what the gentleman from New York, my colleague and friend, Mr. SOLOMON, and what my colleague from California, Ms. PELOSI, are trying to accomplish. But, with all due respect, denying most favored nation status is not the answer and their approach in regard to conditions is not the answer.

Once again, we are proposing to use food as a foreign policy weapon. Once again, perception becomes reality—we somehow feel better if we take action, any action, that is perceived a strong stand against individual oppression and human rights. And, once again, once the laws of unintended effects takes place, once we fully appreciate the practical effect of denying MFN status or placing conditions we know will not be met, supporters of this policy will shrug their shoulders and say, "Well, we didn't mean for this to happen," or perhaps, "tough luck", we should not be trading with the Chinese to begin with.

I know some of my colleagues are tired of hearing this speech but we need to keep repeating it so that we do not repeat making the same mistakes over and over again.

It will not be the Chinese Government who suffers if we revoke or put conditions on MFN so as to render it useless. It will be those who carry forward the memory of the students who were brutally killed in Tiananmen Square, the poor citizens throughout China struggling to get enough to eat, those who suffer from malnutrition and hunger. And, it will punish those in China who now work for reform in progressive regions and in Hong Kong.

And, if this policy is adopted, it will hurt Americans, namely my Kansas farmers who see another 25 to 30 cents coming off wheat prices because of retaliation and decreased exports—prices that have already fallen 35 percent in the last year.

Once again, under the banner of perception we are spilling the blood of American agriculture. Once again, we are contemplating using our farmers and their grain as a foreign policy weapon. And, once again, we are passing up the opportunity to use this Nation's bountiful food supply as an instrument of peace.

Oh yes, its easy to mount the parapets in the fight against man's inhumanity to man. But, after the rhetoric stops, will you accept responsibility for what actually takes place in the real world? Without MFN, the Chinese will take their business elsewhere, to the 100 and more nations, who will not join us in this thinly disguised embargo. The People's Republic is the largest customer for United States wheat in the world. They are projected to purchase over 200 million bushels this marketing year. That is \$500 million that farmers will pay as an obligatory tithe at the alter of perception.

Now, if that is what we are going to do, lets everyone tithe, including Members of Congress. Let us take a 30-percent cut in our salaries to be placed in a human rights fund. Or, at the very least, support a supplemental appropriation to assist farmers as a result of this action.

And, just as the Republic of China is a key market for our farmers, we represent a key market for many Chinese products. That trade is and can be an instrument for peace. The hard line Government in China will respond to that and the Chinese citizen will benefit from the nearly \$5 billion in investment stemming from over 1,300 joint ventures with United States companies.

If we pass either of these amendments today, the practical result will be for China to tighten its belt, suppress all dissent, and unite the country around the idea that throughout the history of China they have been humiliated at the hands of foreigners. Oh, if we want to express outrage, we can send that message but is that really worth the damage?

When the dust clears, China will still be doing business, only with our competitors. They will remain even more firmly opposed to reforms and we will have lost markets that will take years to recover, if they can be recovered. Where is the sense in that?

We could oppose multilateral loans, we can address unfair trade barriers, stop imports produced by prison labor and insist upon Chinese adherence to nonproliferation, there are many policy avenues to be explored. But, let us not repeat the mistakes of the past and sacrifice the farmer at the alter of perceived human rights.

□ 1400

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the reason I reluctantly opposed this rule in the beginning was because the gen-

tleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] was denied his amendment under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. I join him in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I think we both know how the vote is going to come out on this. We are going to get into a discussion of a very important subject later today, and at that point I hope to be speaking at greater length on why I believe a conditioned extension of most-favored-nation trade status is the right way to go.

But at this point I do want to make some comments on the rule, which I think is unnecessarily restrictive.

Last year, my colleagues, you will remember when this issue came to the floor it was then called the Pease bill. Several of us, Congresswoman PELOSI, Congressman WOLF, Congressman PORTER, and I had amendments that were offered and adopted by the full House. I think they improved the bill.

The amendment I offered at that time was an amendment establishing a set of human rights principles for United States companies operating in China, along the lines of the Sullivan principles in South Africa. That amendment which I offered passed this House by a vote of 407 to 9. I was allowed to offer that amendment last year.

This year, the Committee on Rules did not make that amendment or any other amendments, such as were offered last year by myself and my distinguished colleagues, in order.

I think that is a mistake. I think particularly at this stage of the process, when we will probably be sending over a bill to the Senate, a bill cosponsored by Congresswoman PELOSI and myself and several others, one amended in the Committee on Ways and Means, it was certainly appropriate and reasonable to allow the consideration of other amendments that might have further improved the bill and particularly considering that the bill then would probably end up in conference with the Senate.

That was not done by the Committee on Rules. I think that was a mistake. For that reason I must oppose this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], with whom I served on that committee for 10 years.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 189 the rule providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 263, disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation [MFN] treatment to the products

of the People's Republic of China. I commend my colleague, Mr. SOLOMON, the gentleman from New York, for his longstanding leadership on this issue. For many years he has spoken out against the ruthless dictatorship in Beijing, unfortunately, only recently has the world begun to listen.

Mr. Speaker, there is a common myth in this town that in order to bring about positive political change in the People's Republic of China we should continue to grant it MFN and simply wait for the old men who rule from Beijing to fade from the scene. If we deny MFN, it is argued by those favoring MFN, that China will withdraw into its cocoon, and we will undercut the moderates in the Government.

The truth, however, is that by kowtowing to China's oppressive leaders, whether they be young or old, hardline or moderate, we continue to isolate them from universally held ethical and moral standards. Years of external moral and ethical isolation has emboldened China's Communist leaders. According to Amnesty International prodemocracy forces in the People's Republic of China have been hunted down, rounded up, and routinely executed. Asia Watch calls China's rule over occupied Tibet merciless repression. And Freedom House informs us that Tibet is the No. 1 worst area in the world in regards to political freedom. The reauthorization of MFN over the years, has not put a stop to any of the violations of human rights.

Another myth being argued is that MFN will lead to economic liberalization which itself will lead to political pluralism. However, the authorities in Beijing have recentralized banking, credit, production planning, material allocation, foreign trade, and other important elements in the economy. Approximately 3 million private and semiprivate Chinese enterprises have been shutdown and in the majority of the cases only state-run enterprises will benefit from MFN. All of this has happened since reauthorization of MFN after the Tiananmen Square massacre.

Permit me to also point out to my colleagues that MFN did not prevent the People's Republic of China from selling lithium hydride, a chemical precursor to hydrogen bombs, atomic bombs, fuel for ballistic missiles, and poison gas to Iraq while the allied sanctions were in place. Nor did MFN prevent the People's Republic of China from negotiating a sale of M-9 nuclear-capable missiles to Syria and past offers of missiles to Iran, Libya, and Pakistan. The People's Republic of China is also cooperating with North Korea to improve the range of Scud missiles.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation lost over 80,000 soldiers in North Korea and Vietnam fighting Chinese communism. I perceive no overriding reason to let Communist state-run industries and

prodemocracy political prisoners in forced labor camps unfairly compete with American labor. It is an insult to American families who lost sons or daughters in those two wars.

For the sake of our deepest values and most hard-nosed national interests, the United States should not renew MFN for China. Constructive engagement amounts to appeasement in the eyes of the leadership in Beijing. It is time for a new policy toward China and occupied Tibet. The United States Government should stand for freedom by supporting democracy in China and insisting the People's Republic of China negotiate a comprehensive settlement on Tibet before it gets MFN.

Mr. Speaker, the trouble with the People's Republic of China is not the old Communists in Beijing—there are plenty of young, hardline Communists willing to take their place—the trouble with China is the Communist system itself and the world's industrialized nations willingness to continue to bankroll it. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and House Joint Resolution 263 disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation treatment.

□ 1410

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the amendments attached by the Ways and Means Committee to H.R. 2212. As a cosponsor of the bill, I believe that the amendments approved by the committee strengthen and improve the bill.

I want to focus on an amendment that I offered, along with Representative NANCY JOHNSON, under which the President could not request an extension of MFN for China if he finds that the Government of China supports or administers a policy of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization. This condition is added to other human rights conditions in the bill, which is included as one of the Ways and Means en-bloc amendments.

In 1989, President Bush vetoed the foreign operations bill because it contained funding for the U.N. Family Planning Fund [UNFAP] which funds family planning programs in over 140 countries including China. Bush vetoed the foreign operations bill because some of the funding for UNFPA might go to China. The President said it "would clearly place the United States in the position of supporting a program that in turn supports coercive abortions, a program that is inconsistent with American values. Such support \*\*\* would contradict the human rights character of our foreign policy around the world."

If coercive population policies do in fact exist in China, conditioning MFN



on ending these policies is a much more powerful and appropriate way to express our concern than cutting off the U.S. contribution to the 140 countries that depend on UNFPA funds for voluntary family planning. Cutting off U.S. aid to UNFPA would not really affect China because the UNFPA funds less than 1 percent of China's population program and because UNFPA's contribution is a fixed sum.

Conditioning MFN, however, would definitely have a direct impact on the Government of China. Chinese exports to the U.S. totaled \$15.2 billion in 1990—a 27-percent increase over the previous year. Contrary to practices in private market economies, a large segment of the profits from expanded exports flow directly into Chinese Government coffers. If, in fact, China does have coercive policies, we must take this opportunity to express our deep concern about it.

This amendment will also help to resolve the confusion that exists around this policy. There is some legitimate confusion over whether such policies do in fact exist in China, and whether they have the blessing of the Chinese Government. The State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1990 does little to clear up the confusion. It states, on the one hand, that "China's population control policy relies on education, propaganda, and economic incentives, as well as more coercive measures, including psychological pressure and severe economic penalties." On the other hand, it concludes that "[p]hysical compulsion to submit to abortion or sterilization is not authorized, but continues to occur as officials strive to meet population targets."

We need to establish the facts here. Does China have or not support or administer a coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization? This amendment will help us clear up that question, and end the confusion which characterizes the debate on UNFPA.

I am pleased to say that this amendment was approved with overwhelming bipartisan support from my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee. By enlarging the Pelosi conditions to include abortion coercion, we will reaffirm that support here today.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I believe we have 3 minutes remaining, and I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I also yield 2 minutes to my colleague from the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] my friend,

the distinguished ranking member, for yielding, and I thank the very magnanimous gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for yielding his time.

Thomas Jefferson said that two thinking men can be given the exact same set of facts and draw completely different conclusions. This is certainly the case on this issue. Everyone in the House wants to see us address the human rights crisis taking place in China; the problems of arms transfers to Third World countries; as well as the various trade concerns that we all share. We differ only in deciding what the most effective methods would be to accomplish these goals.

Mr. Speaker, I will take a back seat to no one in Congress when it comes to expressing outrage over the human rights violations taking place in China. I have marched with Members from both sides of the aisle to the Chinese Embassy, first to meet with Ambassador Ham Xu, and then again last month, when several Members of Congress were rebuffed by the deputy press attache when we tried to deliver a message expressing our outrage over the continued rights violations. I have stood on the steps of the Capitol to argue against the actions of the repressive despots in China. And I believe that President Bush shares these same concerns and strongly opposes the horrendous human rights policies of the Chinese Government.

During all of this time, I have asked myself: What is the best way to assist our reformist friends in China? Will revoking most-favored-nation trade status do anything at all to release a single political prisoner? Will it prompt a great outpouring of openness and freedom from the Communist Chinese Government? Will it speed the inevitable march toward democracy and a free market?

I have come to the conclusion that it will not. In fact, I am concerned that either revoking or conditioning MFN will complicate the path to reform. I am not alone in holding these views. An excellent article appeared last month in the New York Times which outlined the growing concern among Chinese dissidents about the negative impact that the loss of MFN could have on their efforts.

One leader, Zhang Weiguo, a Shanghai dissident who spent more than 20 months in prison for his activities during the Tiananmen Square demonstrations, pointed out that "the U.S. should support China's economic development and social exchanges."

Why? Because the budding private sector will be hurt far more than the Communist government, and without an economic base, political reform will be even more difficult. Unemployed men and women have to focus their efforts on trying to scratch out a living for their families. They would have little time for petition drives, marches,

letter writing campaigns, and so forth. As the China Information Center, established by Chinese students in the United States during the Tiananmen crackdown, said:

If the path of political transformation is treacherous without the presence of a sizable private economy, it is downright impossible when living standards are falling.

Also, it has been the Chinese private sector which has supported the Chinese student activities. In spite of the political crackdown, economic activity has continued. Economic growth in 1990 totaled 56 percent in the foreign investment enterprise sector. Without these funding sources, resistance to the current regime will be difficult.

A year ago this month, I visited London and had the opportunity to be the first Member of Congress, to meet with famous Chinese dissident Fang Lixhi. As we were discussing the question of most-favored-nation status, and he said to me:

David, you've got to understand that, Deng Xiaoping, Li Peng, who are not young men, will be out of the picture in only a few years. They will be dying, and there are reformers in the forefront. There are reformers like Jiang Zemin, who is a younger man who has not in any way gotten involved in the crackdown against the democracy activists. In fact, the government left him alone, and he is one of those who will conceivably be on the forefront when these older despots are out of the picture.

And Fang said:

David, you've got to understand that when these older men are gone, we need to have a strong economy.

□ 1420

Mr. Speaker, I fear a devastated economy in China if we see the revocation of most-favored-nation status. There are many people within China who have been active members of the reform movement. One dissident who for months was held in prison following the Tiananmen Square massacre has said, "The United States should have a vigorous debate on most-favored-nation status," which we are having, "but in the end it is important that most-favored-nation status be granted."

This is from a man who was held in prison in China for a long period of time. Why? Because he believed that revocation of most-favored-nation status would hurt the reform movement in China, that it would hurt the standard of living in China, and that it would really send a signal to the despots in China that they can in fact establish an even greater wall to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Berlin Wall came down because of one major reason: exposure to Western values. We in the United States have successfully gotten our message through by satellite technology and fax machines into parts of the world that have not up until now enjoyed the kind of freedom that we hope very much the Chinese people will

be able to enjoy. It is obvious that President Bush's policy of engagement has had a great deal of success. We can look to the release of 1,000 detainees following the Tiananmen Square massacre. We can look at the release of Fang Lixhi. We can look at the partial accounting of the whereabouts of dissidents who were detained after Tiananmen Square; the resumption of access for journalists to Tibet, and a number of other positive steps that have been taken.

Indeed, the changes that have taken place since Richard Nixon's famous visit to Peking are remarkable. As President Nixon's policies have since proven, economic cooperation brings political stability both internally and internationally. Certainly we have much, much more to accomplish. We must keep the pressure on the Chinese Government. But we must also be careful not to pull the rug out from under those fighting for freedom in their homeland.

I am angered over the arrest of the Catholic Bishop and laypeople. I am angered by the incarceration of students who were simply expressing their hopes for a more just society. I am angered by China's continued sale of weapons to the Third World. And I am not in any way whitewashing those problems; they are very serious, but I am convinced that we are not continuing with business as usual. The President, through his policy, Mr. Speaker, has continued to stand up on weapons transfers, on OPIC loans, and a litany of other actions which the Chinese have pursued since the Tiananmen Square massacre. American sanctions against high-technology transfers, against high-speed computer sales and preventing weapons sales, are still in place. President Bush is vigorously pursuing a section 301 complaint against China for intellectual property rights violations. So when people stand up and try to claim that business as usual is continuing, they are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we will bury the despots of China with Western values and Western ways through our free enterprise system. I believe that there is a Lech Walesa out there for the Chinese people. There is a yearning for freedom. It is in the interest of the American consumer, the American worker, and the Chinese people, a billion of them, and the future of the free world for us to adopt a policy that will be effective in promoting change in the People's Republic of China. This may not be the policy that quenches our thirst for punishing the Chinese Government, but it will offer the best hope for empowering the Chinese people. In my opinion, preserving our economic influence is the best way to accomplish these goals.

Thank you.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, I yield back

the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL DEBATE ON THE SUBJECT OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Pursuant to House Resolution 189, it is now in order to debate the subject of most-favored-nation treatment for the People's Republic of China.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the first resolution or the first matter we have to take up is disapproval of most-favored-nation treatment or normal trade treatment for China. Obviously it is a motion that should be defeated. None of us in this Chamber condone or in any way like the actions that took place in China known as Tiananmen Square, nor the repressive activities that China has shrunk back to in the last 2 years. We want to change all that.

The best way to change it, the most humane way to change it is for the United States to stay involved in the process in China, and unless we continue to trade with them, we have no way of being involved and we will send China back into isolation as it previously existed for about 40 years and we will do a great deal of damage to many fine people in China and also in this country.

So, while I realize that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is perfectly sincere in his desire to improve relations in China, he has picked the wrong tool to deal with it. We should defeat his resolution and we should go then to the consideration of the Pelosi recommendation that has been favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] care to allocate time?

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the resolutions and the bill considered pursuant to House Resolution 189.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the second consecutive year, we are debating the future of United States trade relations with China. The reasons for returning to this issue are clear to everyone in this chamber. In June 1989, the hard-line leaders of China engaged in an unprovoked massacre of students and workers demonstrating peacefully for greater freedom of speech and political reforms. Since that time, those leaders have maintained many of the repressive policies put in place since the 1989 crackdown in Tiananmen Square. They have sentenced many of the nonviolent demonstrators to months, even years, in prison. Many prisoners remain unaccounted for. China has been engaged in the sale of missiles and nuclear technology to countries of the Middle East and southern Asia. Other human rights and foreign policy actions of China are also cause for great concern.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this body will be given the opportunity to vote today on three measures relating to China's most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status.

The first measure is House Joint Resolution 263, which would cut off China's MFN status 60 days after enactment. The resolution was reported without recommendation by the Committee on Ways and Means, in order to provide Members of the House an opportunity to vote on the measure. I believe Members should resist the inclination to strike blindly at China by cutting off China's MFN status. We all want to see an improvement in the human rights situation in China. We all want to see an end to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The question is, What is the best way to achieve that goal? Mr. Speaker, I believe we stand a far greater chance of influencing events in China by remaining engaged there. I will, therefore, oppose House Joint Resolution 263.

The second measure we will consider today is H.R. 2212, introduced by our colleague, NANCY PELOSI, with many other cosponsors. H.R. 2212 was reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means. The bill imposes a number of conditions which China must meet before the President may recommend that China's MFN status be continued in 1992.

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have reservations about certain aspects of H.R. 2212 as reported by the committee. I worked with Congresswoman PELOSI and other interested Members of the House to craft an amendment, which clarified certain provisions of the introduced bill. However, the committee adopted other amendments, which considerably expanded the list of conditions which China must meet by next year. Those amendments will be offered as an en bloc amendment later.



I am concerned that H.R. 2212 as approved by the committee may set such high standards that the Chinese may decide that they either cannot, or will not, meet the bill's conditions. In that case, the President will have no choice but to terminate China's MFN status in 1992. Nonetheless, I am prepared to support the bill as amended, with the hope that we can improve the bill in conference with the other body.

The final measure on which the House is scheduled to vote today is House Concurrent Resolution 174, introduced by Congressman SOLARZ. The resolution—which was referred jointly to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Foreign Affairs—was reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means, without amendment. It expresses the sense of the Congress on Chinese actions relating to the proliferation of nuclear and missile technology. I believe this resolution is an appropriate response to a very serious problem, and I intend to support it.

□ 1430

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we debate once again the important issue of United States policy toward China in the wake of the violent crackdown on peaceful demonstrators in Tiananmen Square. Actually, and appropriately, the debate has never stopped during the 2 years since that appalling act of aggression against Chinese people seeking freedom.

The time that has passed, and the two bills that are before us now, indicate how difficult it is to legislate sanctions and conditions against China which would successfully pressure the current government to change its human rights practices.

The first bill, House Joint Resolution 263, would end normal tariff treatment, so-called most-favored-nation [MFN] status for China.

The time that has passed, and the two bills that are before us now, indicate how difficult it is to legislate sanctions and conditions against China which would successfully pressure the current government to change its human rights practices.

This is an extremely harsh response to the problem of China's recent behavior.

More importantly, the effect of this bill would be to end United States influence in China, isolate that country further, and ruin the United States businesses and investments that have grown in China since President Nixon's historic visit in 1972.

Such unilateral action would hurt the very people in China who have struggled against the harsh leadership and have dared to pursue democratic ideals and free market principles.

The second bill, H.R. 2212, would establish inflexible and difficult to ascer-

tain conditions for renewal of MFN tariff treatment in 1992.

Although a well-meaning attempt to construct a carrot-and-stick-policy toward China, the effect of this measure will likely be the same as House Joint Resolution 263.

The bill requires China to meet unattainable and arbitrary conditions that will certainly result in withdrawal of MFN.

Both bills represent legislation that is dangerous as well as ineffective in achieving United States goals with respect to China and throughout the region.

A backlash in China will only serve to reinforce the hardliners in Beijing at the expense of those who continue to resist repression and work for continued economic and political reform.

However strongly we oppose the actions of the current leadership, the United States must consider the impact on the Chinese people themselves and on Hong Kong, as well as on ourselves, of any action or policy we pursue.

House Joint Resolution 263 and H.R. 2212 offer the wrong approach—a defeatist approach. We must work with the President to develop constructive and effective sanctions that will be successful in molding the actions of the Chinese Government without undermining our own interests or those of the Chinese people. As chairman GIBBONS stated, we must stay involved and engaged to have any influence on what happens in China.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on both bills.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE].

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering essentially two options with respect to the extension of most-favored-nation [MFN] status for the People's Republic of China [PRC]. Congressman SOLOMON's bill—House Joint Resolution 263—represents one option, that is, to revoke MFN or to disapprove the President's extension of this preferential trade status. The second is outlined in Ms. PELOSI's bill—H.R. 2212—which I amended along with other members on the Ways and Means Committee including Congressmen MOODY, CRANE, STARK, DOWNEY, and indirectly, Mr. SOLARZ as well. This bill establishes conditions that the Government in Beijing must meet before China will be granted MFN status beyond June 1992. The conditions span a number of areas including human rights, trade, and foreign policy.

I strongly support the conditional approach to the extension of MFN for China and will therefore cast my vote today in favor of H.R. 2212.

In my view, the human rights abuses that the Government in Beijing has

committed over the past few years—the most heinous of which came to light during and after the prodemocracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square—have been egregious enough to warrant linkage to China's status as a trading partner to the United States.

It is also my belief that the People's Republic of China will not improve its human rights record unless the United States Government uses the leverage it has over this Asian nation in the form of MFN. For China, MFN status means billions of dollars annually. This is revenue that the Government of China, no matter how hardline, cannot afford to lose. I view the threat of revocation of MFN as a bigger, more effective stick than actual revocation.

Additionally, history has shown that the use of conditional MFN extension has achieved the desired effect, in terms of pushing the Chinese Government in the direction of human rights reform. The conditionality bill that I sponsored last year provides a case in point. The mere introduction of this legislation resulted in the release of a number of political prisoners in China.

In contrast, I believe that revocation of MFN would prove counterproductive by weakening those entrepreneurial entities in South China and Hong Kong that have been largely responsible for the People's Republic of China's movement toward commercial reform. These same entities have been active in pressuring the central government in China into political and social liberalization.

Some argue that attaching conditions to the extension of MFN will ultimately bring about revocation. Let me make clear that those of us involved in developing the original conditionality proposal of this year—Congresswoman PELOSI, Congressman SOLARZ, and myself—had no intention of "painting President Bush into a corner," so to speak. In crafting H.R. 2212, we sought to fashion conditions that would prove effective and meaningful in the struggle for better human rights policy in China without being so stringent that the Government of the People's Republic of China would not be able to fully comply within the allotted time period and our President would be forced to cut off MFN.

Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SOLARZ, and I were also striving to write a bill that had the chance to become law either through the President's approval or through the veto override process. It was our feeling that limiting the conditions to the human rights area would make the bill more palatable to the administration.

The conditions added during the Ways and Means Committee markup obviously go beyond the realm of human rights. While these extra amendments might increase the possibility of a Presidential veto, I personally feel that they are all appropriate and logical additions to the original

bill and serve only to strengthen it. Furthermore, I believe that we have the votes in the House to override a veto from the White House. I wholeheartedly support H.R. 2212 as amended by Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI's en bloc amendment and I urge you to vote for it as well.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, the father of modern day democracy, Thomas Jefferson, once said that he swore upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over mankind. That is why we are here today.

Tiananmen Square was real—tyranny at its worst. The Chinese Government may deny that it ever happened. But we saw it.

We all watched as young men and women were mowed down by the military. We all watched as their symbol for hope, the goddess of democracy, was toppled. We saw it happen.

And because as a democracy we pledge eternal hostility against every form of tyranny against mankind, we must take a stand against what happened in Tiananmen Square.

That is the reason that today I will support the Solomon bill that would disapprove the extension of most-favored-nation status to the People's Republic of China.

We need to send a message to the Communist leaders of China that we don't believe their history books and we don't intend to give preferential trade treatment to governments that kill their own people.

However, because I question whether or not the Solomon bill will ever be enacted into law, I will also vote for the Pelosi bill which conditions MFN status on improvements in human rights practices and nuclear nonproliferation.

The opponents of this bill will state that the conditions set forth in the Pelosi bill are too rigid and that it will be hard for them to be lived up to.

First, most of the conditions require for the People's Republic of China to make significant progress in human rights practices. From a nation that kills its own people I find it inconceivable that this is too tough a standard to meet.

We ask for significant progress in areas like freedom from torture, free press, fair trials, and humane prison conditions. Rights that we hold dear in America, but are only a vision in a young Chinese student's mind.

Second, opponents of the Pelosi bill claim that we cannot afford the economic consequences of an isolated China. I think that Jefferson would say that there are some values upon which an economic price cannot be placed. Basic human rights is one of them.

It seems that the arguments against the Pelosi bill come from the fact that

the practices of the Chinese Government are so abysmal that asking for improvements is just asking too much. That is a tough premise to swallow.

We need to make a stand. Jefferson swore hostility against tyranny. We should do no less today.

□ 1440

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], for doing a very, very excellent job. She has, in fact, been a leader in the area of human rights with respect to China, and I have to give her a great deal of credit for bringing this policy to the floor, and certainly the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], as well.

At the same time I would have to say that I am going to have to oppose not only the Solomon amendment but the Pelosi proposal as well. I think the direction that the House will be going and also the Senate will be going, in adding conditions to the MFN agreement with China, is the exact opposite of the direction we should go if in fact we want to open up China.

If Members will recall, when Mikhail Gorbachev first talked about glasnost, he talked about political freedom. And then he began to realize that unless one has economic freedom, political freedom will not occur. And we have to compare not 1989 in China and today, but 1980 in China and today, when President Carter opened up China and the United States, where we had bilateral trade relations.

Think of how much progress has been made because literally thousands of students have come to the United States. We now have businessmen coming from China to the United States and vice versa. And as a result of that, democracy will occur in China only when we begin to open up China with more and more trade relations.

The direction of threatening China with respect to cutting off trade, in my opinion, is the exact opposite direction of where we should go if in fact we want China to open up and have democracy and many of those freedoms that were discussed in the conditions in the Pelosi bill.

Let me say this, some will say, why not have conditions anyway? It does not make any difference.

The fact of the matter is, it does make a great deal of difference, because if in fact the Chinese Government does not comply with those conditions, and they will not, I can tell my colleagues they will not, a year from now we are going to be here saying, how are we going to continue trade and save face. And we are going to eventually back down, and that would be the

worst thing for the Congress from an international perspective with respect to the Chinese. They will then not work with the United States in the United Nations. They will not work with the United States on international issues because we will be, at that time, the paper tiger.

I am hopeful that this House will try and understand whether it is in conference, or whether it is here on the floor, or the Senate, that we need trade with China if we want to open China up, and both the Solomon and Pelosi amendments are the opposite direction of that. It is the wrong way to go.

Mr. Speaker, the specific topic at issue on the floor today is China's trade status with the United States. Unfortunately, however, recent Chinese behavior has broadened what should have been the focus of the debate, and we now find ourselves addressing Chinese social atrocities, and overall United States policy toward China, in the framework of international trade.

There should be no doubt that the events of Tiananmen Square were abhorrent to the United States. There should be no doubt that China's human rights record is deplorable. Proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and missile technology is clearly antithetical to U.S. policy, as well as to internationally accepted guidelines, and incidents of abusive implementation of birth control regulations and coerced prison labor can be considered no less than despicable.

There is not a Member of this Congress who would deny that the promotion of fundamental human rights is anything less than a premiere cornerstone of our foreign policy. In addition, most, if not all, Members agree that we need to seek a stronger commitment from the Chinese on nonproliferation and on fair trade. However, the real question is whether we should use the tools of trade to achieve our social policy objectives. While all agree that social atrocities have occurred in China and that there has been a lack of progress in human rights conditions since then, I do not believe that terminating MFN status for China is the right cure for the ill.

Part of the problem is that today's issue is poorly named. Most-favored-nation status is a misnomer because the status it affords is neither special nor preferential. In fact, it is currently extended by the United States to over 160 countries, many with whom we have significant policy disagreements. MFN status is currently denied to only 11 countries. Extending this status merely means maintaining what has become the status quo trading posture with our trade partners.

While extending MFN status gives China nothing preferential, terminating that status for China would hurt American business. Chinese retaliation is sure to affect United States investment in China. Importation of Chinese goods would become prohibitively expensive. Replacement markets are not always available, due for example to quota restrictions, to fill the void in textiles, electrical appliances, toys, footwear, and apparel, to name a few currently low-cost Chinese export items that are popular here. The impact would then eventually be felt by the American consumer.



Export trade with China would be severely diminished, if not eliminated, due to Chinese retaliation that would threaten \$5 billion in exports and over 100,000 United States jobs.

Most importantly, however, is the fact that termination of MFN status would hurt the very people we purport to wish to help. For over a decade, we have worked to build United States-Sino relations. We have established business links with a country encompassing one-fourth of the world's population. Through business contacts, we have exposed the Chinese to our democratic ways and encouraged political and economic reform. Terminating MFN would seriously damage the Hong Kong economy and threaten the most progressive and market-oriented coastal provinces, such as Guangdong, which support reform. United States leverage regarding trade, weapons proliferation, and human rights would be sharply reduced, and channels of education and communication would be reduced, thereby seriously weakening the more progressive forces in contemporary China.

Many of my colleagues have determined that the extension of MFN status this year for China must be accompanied by conditionality. As I have already stated, I do not believe that the tools of trade policy should be used to impose social objectives on another trading partner, and particularly through the use of stringent, unrealistic conditions. The conditionality contained in this legislation is neither reasonable nor flexible. I cannot support an approach that forces the hands of both the Chinese and United States Governments in a unproductive fashion. Creating a chain of events whereby we remove MFN status for China is as unproductive as not granting it in the first place. By legislating these conditions, we are setting ourselves up to ultimately terminate an important United States-Sino liaison and the important progressive opportunities that it carries with it for China. That result does not serve U.S. foreign policy or economic interests and, therefore, this approach should be rejected.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution disapproving the President's waiver recommendation. The issue of China's trade status is a deeply troubling one because the repressive policies of the dictators in Peking continually disrupt an already difficult bilateral relationship. On balance, however, I am persuaded that the United States must continue to be engaged in the Chinese market in order to protect our long-term strategic and economic interests in the Pacific region.

We cannot divorce the question of MFN status from the question of Hong Kong's security or the question of United States support for Taiwan's application to join the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. These two issues are vitally important to the evolution of the world economy.

Fully 70 percent of China's exports to the United States flow through the territory of Hong Kong. Denying renewal of MFN will threaten business confidence in Hong Kong, further undermining the future viability of this re-

gion and its economic prosperity. Many Hong Kong citizens are fleeing their homes because they fear their heritage of political freedom will be lost when the Chinese take control in 1997.

These Hong Kong citizens saw themselves in the faces of the students demonstrating peacefully in Tiananmen Square. I believe we should work diligently to preserve the Hong Kong miracle after 1997 so that it remains an irresistible inspiration for change in China. The President must have the opportunity to weigh this consideration carefully when he makes his MFN recommendation.

If Congress ultimately votes to continue MFN for China for another year, we must also urge the administration to endorse and promote Taiwan's application for GATT membership. I support our Trade Representative in sending the message to China that dramatic political and economic liberalizations will be rewarded by a seat among the contracting parties to the GATT. In this regard, China will do well to follow Taiwan's lead.

The political issues surrounding Taiwan's relationship to China do not have to be addressed directly, as Taiwan has applied for GATT membership as a customs union. Furthermore, Taiwan is prepared to enter the GATT assuming the full responsibilities of a developed country and thereby furthering a basic U.S. trade policy objective: that of lesser developed country graduation to full GATT participation.

I wish to remind my colleagues that while China may succeed again in preserving column one tariff treatment, the position of being subject to the annual renewal process is not a favorable one. Growing more difficult each year, the renewal fight clouds bilateral trade relations with great uncertainty and subjects the Chinese to tough scrutiny and condemnation by Americans.

To my mind, expressing United States principles with respect to repressive policies in China can take a more constructive form than turning off the MFN light switch on our trade relationship. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the resolution of disapproval and no later today on H.R. 2212, which while well-intentioned, would impose impossible conditions on MFN renewal; and, finally, on the Archer motion to recommit.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Pelosi language on this bill and opposed to the more extreme form of the Solomon amendment. I also specifically want to endorse the en bloc amendments by the committee which I think were a wise addition.

Of course, I want to highlight the fact that one of those amendments in the en bloc amendments focuses on the issue which has torn this body apart on

several occasions; namely, the question of whether or not there was coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization in China.

This body has never received a definitive finding from the administration on that question, and I think all Members on the question of abortion can agree that we could not contemplate involuntary abortions or involuntary sterilizations. No matter how one feels about family planning, I do not know anyone who supports that—at least in this body or this country.

□ 1450

Yet it has been a debate which has torn us apart here in this body when we discussed money for U.N. family planning activities. So this amendment has a double virtue. This particular amendment has a double virtue both clarifying that by requiring the administration to make a finding and, at the same time, including that human rights violation in the list of violations which would disqualify China for MFN treatment.

I can think of no more horrendous human rights violation than involuntary sterilization or forced abortion; therefore, I strongly commend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for leading us to the point of conditioning MFN on human rights, and among those human rights, I certainly appreciate the fact that my committee and my chairman have allowed us to enter that issue, and include that, as one of the human rights conditions in this bill.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support that as well.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we cannot ignore the fact that China is a major power in Asia and has a growing influence in the world at large. We have pursued mutual goals in the Persian Gulf crisis and in seeking a political settlement in Cambodia.

However, because of our concerns over the policies of the Chinese Government, there can be little doubt that our relationship with the People's Republic of China has seriously deteriorated since the tragic massacre at Tiananmen Square 2 years ago.

Since Tiananmen, the Chinese Government has conducted sham trials of student demonstrators and suppressed dissidents in total disregard of world opinion and universal standards of decency.

It tortures and mistreats those accused of crimes, persecutes Catholic and Protestant churches that refuse to affiliate with government-sponsored religious organizations, and force Chinese women to undergo abortions and sterilization.

It has snubbed its nose at accepted standards of honest dealing in inter-

national trade that has led to a \$10 billion trade deficit with the People's Republic of China. Intellectual property rights violations, continued patent infringements, widespread textile quota violations, continued barriers to our imports, and excessive state intervention plague our economic relationship with China.

There are a number of other concerns that infect our bilateral relationship. There are ominous signs that China will soon sell its newest missile systems to sensitive countries like Pakistan and Syria, and there is concern that China has been less than forthcoming in the transfer of nuclear technology to other nations.

Mr. Speaker, most-favored-nation status is basically a trade matter. However, because of our many concerns with regard to China, the continuation of MFN has taken on a political aspect reserved for no other country that now receives MFN.

As we consider the MFN issue today, our objective is the same regardless of whether we support ending MFN, conditioning it, or as the administration has requested, extending MFN without conditions.

We seek to support the forces of change in China that will bring about political and economic reform, a decent respect for human rights and individual freedoms, a level playing field in our trading relationship, and a responsible approach to the export of weapons and nuclear technology.

Because the People's Republic of China is an important power, the actions we take today and in the coming weeks should encourage China to participate and not isolate itself from the international community.

The crucial question to be considered during this debate is what are the appropriate means to bring about the desired changes, and whether there is a reasonable expectation that using MFN will bring about these changes.

I would like to think there is a more structured, more subtle way to developing our policy toward China than the Congress-administration shootouts of the past few years.

Next week, I plan to introduce a resolution that would lead us to this goal. It would establish a Commission on United States relations with China that could lay the basis for a national consensus on our relations with this important country. Its members would be appointed by the President, with appointees to be drawn from the upper ranks of the government, the Congress, and the private sector.

Regardless of how the votes turn out today, we must continue to focus on the key objectives of our long-range policy toward China—namely encouraging that country to continue the reform process and to become a full participant in the international community of nations. The creation of a Unit-

ed States-China Commission could, I believe, lead us toward this objective by developing a United States policy that speaks with a clear, single voice.

Mr. Speaker, I will include as a part of my statement a copy of the letter I wrote to President Bush outlining the rationale and the goals of a United States-China Commission.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 1991.

The President,  
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Many in Congress and the public continue to have serious concerns about the situation in China. The severe human rights abuses highlighted by the Tiananmen Square massacre of 1989 have not been resolved. Other aspects of Chinese policy—particularly its grudging response to international initiatives to address global and regional security concerns—also raise doubts whether the Chinese government is prepared to be a responsible actor in the community of nations.

There is no denying that China is an extremely important country with which the United States should if possible maintain a working relationship. You have emphasized this point in announcing your decision to renew most-favored-nation (MFN) trade status. You have also eloquently stated your belief that continued economic and political ties between the United States and China are in the long run benefit of the Chinese people.

Once again this year, however, Congress may take actions that could threaten relations between the United States and China. This would occur if Congress attempts to impose conditions that would be difficult or impossible to meet on the renewal of most-favored-nation (MFN) trade status. Withdrawal of MFN would undoubtedly lead to the exclusion of U.S. products from the Chinese market and to virtual elimination of U.S. influence in China.

Various demands have been made in both houses of Congress to impose conditions on continuation of MFN. I understand your position that it would be desirable to avoid such conditions. In my view, reasonable conditions could send an important signal to the Chinese leadership that it cannot continue to expect business as usual with the United States unless our concerns about China's internal situation and external behavior are resolved. At the same time, I feel that the major issues in U.S.-China relations should be pursued separately from MFN.

Congressional action imposing conditions on renewal of MFN is more likely this year than previously. For example, it is probable that the House of Representatives will adopt certain conditions, including one concerning accountability for the Tiananmen Square massacre, that would not easily be met by the Chinese. The Senate is also likely to propose conditions on MFN as well as insist on other steps to address the main issues in U.S.-China relations.

The yearly battle between the Administration and Congress on renewal of MFN has not been constructive for U.S. interests in China. It has resulted in mixed signals to the Chinese government combined with the chance of a rupture in normal relations in the event Congress imposes conditions that would be difficult or impossible to meet. While it may be good politics for some in Congress, this situation should not be permitted to continue.

During your meeting with several Members of the House June 7, I described a proposal

that I believe could offer a way out of this impasse. This would be to establish a special commission on U.S. relations with China composed of senior U.S. officials, leading members of Congress and distinguished persons from the private sector (including experts on China). It would be the mandate of the commission to review U.S.-China relations and publish recommendations prior to the time for the next renewal of MFN.

This year's Congressional debate on MFN has largely taken shape, and there will be little chance to move this proposal forward in Congress at the current time. I will, however, continue to develop this idea for use later, perhaps in connection with a move to override your veto if that stage is reached. Meanwhile, I would encourage you to consider it seriously as a way to broaden the circle of decision-making and deepen public understanding on U.S.-China relations.

Mr. President, I am convinced that an independent examination of our relations with China would conclude that the Administration's policy is generally correct. Such an examination could however, take up the issues in disagreement between the Executive and Legislative branches and make recommendations for resolving them so that we can avoid counterproductive political debate on this matter in the future.

I hope you will seriously consider the idea of forming a special commission on relations with China. Please be assured that this concept is offered in a positive way by one of your strongest supporters in Congress on this as well as other foreign policy issues.

With every best wish for the continued success of your policies.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD,  
Ranking Republican Member.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2212.

I had an opportunity to visit China with some other Members in November, and it was, indeed, an interesting experience. We had an opportunity to talk with Premier Li Peng and to discuss face to face on some very tough terms that had gone on in Tiananmen Square and in China.

But, really, having come back from that trip, my estimate is that isolating China is not in our best interest, and I would suggest to the Members here that ultimately it is whether we want to sacrifice American jobs, American trade, on the altar of somehow punishing the Chinese or whether we want to keep them somehow engaged through our trade process.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about potentially 100,000 American jobs that are directly tied to China and to trade with China; wheat, cotton, timber, chemicals, computers, and aircraft and many more are involved in this process. Trade relations that amount to \$20 billion a year will cease because of this kind of unwarranted legislation.

There has got to be a better way that we can influence what goes on within China than to shoot ourselves in the foot. Look some of the workers in the eye in your districts and tell them that



they are going to lose a job because we are trying to punish China; 100,000 potential American jobs.

How about those companies that have invested over \$40 billion in capital invested in China? What happens to Hong Kong, that pure form of capitalism that has developed over there? What happens with the future of Hong Kong if we deny them that kind of business?

If we eliminate China's MFN status, Hong Kong will lose 43,000 jobs as well as \$1.2 billion in income in the first year alone.

Let us not make that mistake. Let us work with China, trade with China, influence their policy through a constructive effort.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to our distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHULZE].

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, some will contend today that revoking China's MFN status would terminate United States-China trade, or cause drastic price increases on Chinese products. This is hardly the case.

I looked at the top Chinese imports, and determined what the worst case per-unit price increase would be to the U.S. importer, if these items were to lose MFN tariff treatment and be subjected to column 2—or non-MFN—duties.

In unstuffed fashion dolls, the average per-unit cost to the U.S. importer would increase from \$4.48 to \$6.80. In footwear with uppers of over 90 percent rubber or plastic, the average per-unit cost would increase from \$4.27 to \$5.44. In footwear with leather uppers and rubber soles, the average per-unit cost would increase from \$8.43 to \$9.19. In footwear with 100 percent rubber or plastic outer soles, the average per-unit cost would increase from \$1.48 to \$1.63.

Even if all of the costs of the additional column 2 duties are passed on to the retail level, Chinese products would continue to enjoy a price advantage over higher cost competing products. Further, they would still represent a bargain to American consumers.

Also, as a nonmarket economy country, China will use its ability to absorb additional costs in order to expand its \$10 to \$15 billion trade surplus with the United States. Continued access to United States markets means continued access to the hard currency China desperately needs. MFN or no MFN, China is too shrewd to forgo trade with the United States.

If you do not believe me, however, consider an analysis by the established Hong Kong firm, Baring Securities, on the effects of revoking China's MFN status. I quote:

There is reason to believe that mainland-based manufacturers enjoy considerable room for maneuver in terms of their ability to control labor costs and profit margins, and that they would not boost prices in direct proportion to tariff increases.

Reluctance to sacrifice market share is prevalent among Asian industrialists. The Chinese Government can also be expected to devalue the renminbi—possibly even sharply—in order to facilitate the adjustment to the shock of losing MFN treatment.

Even if MFN status for China ceases, United States-China trade will not.

□ 1500

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Resolution of Disapproval, House Joint Resolution 263, and of H.R. 2212, legislation to condition future most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status on respect for basic freedoms in China and Tibet.

Mr. Speaker, we have had too much vagueness and too much ambiguity in the messages that we have been sending to the Chinese Government. That vagueness and that ambiguity must come to an end.

I am sure all of us in this body remember sitting glued in front of our television sets that June watching the struggle for freedom in China. We marveled at the stirring sight of millions of people taking to the streets in peaceful protest. They were not throwing rocks. They were not throwing Molotov cocktails. They carried no weapons. They were armed with the most powerful message of all: that the yearning for freedom is universal and ultimately irresistible.

We were all witnesses to that event. We saw the tanks and troops. We saw the courage of one simple man who resolutely stood before a column of advancing tanks and refused to let them pass. We saw the bloody square.

Today, many months after this stunning event, over 270 prodemocracy protesters remain in detention without trial. Execution and torture is still not uncommon.

Asia Watch recently reported that China is systematically exploiting the labor of prisoners to produce cheap goods for export.

China continues to be intransigent in loosening restrictions on foreign travel, and its already repressive emigration policies have become worse. In fact, the Department of State reports that China has tightened existing restrictions on foreign travel.

And, despite a pledge from the Chinese Government not to engage in nuclear proliferation, there is evidence that the Government continues to actively promote the transfer of nuclear weapons technology.

Mr. Speaker, today we must send a clear and unambiguous message.

A message of sympathy to the families of those who died in Tiananmen Square.

A message of solidarity to those who were courageous enough to risk their lives on behalf of freedom and democracy in China.

And a message to the Chinese Government that if it does not improve its human rights record, improve its treatment of dissidents, and cooperate in the establishment of an international nuclear nonproliferation regime, that most-favored-nation status for China will be gone.

The legislation before us sends precisely that message. Let us remain steadfast in our support of the Chinese people in their struggle for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, just about 1 year ago the United States continued the policy of unconditional extension of most-favored-nation trade status with China. That is the policy which the President proposes again.

The question we must ask is, How has it worked the past year? Has it produced change in China? Positive change? The answer, unfortunately, is "no". The prisoners are still unaccounted for. Prisoners are still in jail. Harassment of Chinese students still goes on in the United States, conducted by representatives of the Chinese mainland government. Jamming of the Voice of America still goes on, and as the unfavorable trade balance grows, China continues to dump products on the American market, manufactured by slave labor.

If a policy does not produce positive change, it is time to change a policy. That is what we should do. I think the preferable way to change it is to adopt the Pelosi proposal, of which I and others are cosponsors, calling for an extension of most-favored-nation trade status, but with some very clear strong conditions, that put China on notice as to what we expect during the coming year, if they are going to get an extension a year from now.

This is the best way to use incentives. This is the best way to use our leverage, to bring about change. It leaves open the other options, if this fails, for later. We can always move to revocation or even back to unconditional extension.

I believe that this conditioned extension of most-favored-nation trade status will best align the United States with the future leaders of China. It will send a message to them that, yes, we care about trade, but we also care about democracy, and China, we are on your side.

This proposal will also send the best message to the whole world, that the

United States is a leader, both in promoting trade and in the economics sphere, but we are a leader in standing up for freedom around the world. Trade and human rights do not have to be opposites. They can go together. We have to look at our relationship with China. A nation that respects human rights will respect economic rights, and vice versa. In the long term, a democratic China will be better for American trade and investment.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, these are matters of judgment, and reasonable people can differ, but I think there is a good reason to question the President's approach in this whole area.

Today he lifts sanctions on South Africa. Today he urges no conditions on MFN for China. The President is at least being consistent. He will fight military might with might, but he shies away from the use of sustained pressure when it comes to human oppression by other governments.

As he said today, "I have never been enthusiastic about sanctions in the first place, and when I end them," he says, "I will do it cheerfully."

However, I am afraid that rhetoric alone is not going to suffice. The history of humankind shows the opposite. At the very least here, there should be conditionality. Read the Amnesty International report on China. Hundreds of prisoners remain imprisoned; many new arrests of political and religious activists; government opponents sentenced to prison terms after unfair trials. Torture is rampant. I am afraid the jawboning is not likely to bring freedom to the people of China.

I suggest, as I said, at the least, there should be conditionality and firm conditionality on any MFN for China.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 2212, conditions on most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status for China in 1991.

My support for this resolution is based upon the fact that China needs to change its behavior if it is to retain the benefits of being a member of the family of nations. China's human rights record is deplorable. It continues to sell ballistic missiles to the Middle East, including Iraq and Iran. The government policy of coercive abortion, the brutal repression of dissent, and the continued occupation and destruction of Tibet makes it impossible to continue business as usual with China.

We keep hearing the promises of reform, but these promises are contradicted by actions. We can no longer follow a policy of appeasement, hoping that if we give a carrot up front then we will somehow gain influence over China's behavior. This policy has not worked, and I don't think continuing the policy gains us much. If we truly want to attain the ends which we all seek, we need to also have a credible threat.

There is no reason to be vindictive and cut off MFN status for fiscal year 1991. We are

not out to punish China, but, rather, to provide incentives for a modification of future behavior. House Joint Resolution 2212 does just this: Conditioning further MFN status on a reformation of Chinese policies on human rights, arms sales, abortion, and trade policy.

I understand the problems American exporters face with this situation. We do export \$5 billion in goods annually. But the \$15 billion worth of goods which we import—some of which is produced by prison labor—is far more important to China than our exports are to our total balance of trade. Furthermore, if the administration was truly concerned with United States business interests in China, more effort would be spent opening markets to United States products, and reducing China's unfair trade practices.

It is not my intent to shut the door on relations with China. This is a country rich in history and tradition, and could give much to the future. Nonetheless, the recent actions and policies of China make it morally intolerable to provide unconditional MFN status to China without some incentive to discontinue its deplorable behavior.

Mr. LAROCO. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, President Bush formally requested the renewal of most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status for the Peoples Republic of China. This is the same China which in June 1989 directed a massacre at Tiananmen Square where over 1,000 prodemocracy advocates were brutally murdered.

China was originally granted preferential trade treatment in 1980. The continuation of MFN status is conditional on an annual Presidential review. Revocation of this trade privilege would subject some 90 percent of Chinese imports to higher tariffs which, in turn, would require its exporters to pay nearly \$6 billion in additional duties. The bottom line is simple. A drastic reduction in annual foreign revenues would send a strong message a China's Government. The oppression of freedom can no longer be tolerated.

The reasons to suspend China's MFN status are obvious: widespread political oppression, the violent injustices done to its people, and the continued production and sale of nuclear-related weapons technology.

President Bush argues that using trade as a political weapon is unfair, and would punish the entire Chinese population instead of a handful of leaders in Beijing. The truth is that a handful of leaders has been punishing the Chinese population for decades. Restricting MFN status is our greatest chance to correct this injustice, and the best way to show the world that American assistance should not be taken for granted.

Last year, as in years past, the President urged the renewal of MFN trade status based on the economic importance of the relationship. He cited mutual benefits to both nations involved and a belief that, given time, the human rights record would improve.

Yet President Bush managed to ignore China's ongoing exploitation of prison labor. China produces large quantities of goods at a cheap rate because it forces its prisoners, many of whom were jailed for their prodemocratic beliefs, to work unpaid in factories under near slave-like conditions. With this type of unfair and inhumane competition,

it is no wonder American workers are finding it difficult to compete with less expensive Chinese-made products.

China also poses a threat to global safety. As the only major nuclear power which has refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, it continues to promote the nuclear capabilities of several volatile nations. China has provided tritium to Pakistan, sent plutonium ingredients to India, aided in the construction of a bomb-producing nuclear reactor in Algeria, and shipped uranium to Brazil, Argentina, and South Africa.

Congress can be certain that the threatened removal of MFN would provide a much needed wakeup call. The time has come to make it known that China's lucrative trade relationship with America cannot be taken for granted.

In a commencement address at Yale University last month President Bush said that American foreign policy has always been "more than simply an expression of American interests. It's an extension of American ideals." I could not agree with him more—which is why I oppose his request for further support of an oppressive, antidemocratic regime.

Mr. Speaker, the unconditioned extension of MFN status clearly contradicts American interests abroad. It is time to admit that the President's policy toward China has not worked, and time to adopt a policy which will.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2212, the Pelosi bill, which would condition the renewal of most-favored-nation [MFN] status for China.

Two years ago the world witnessed the horror of events that occurred in Tiananmen Square—tanks and troops advancing on unarmed students. China's human rights record remains deplorable. Since Tiananmen Square, the human rights situation has gotten worse and many of those intellectuals, students and workers that America's hearts went out to that day, are now languishing in the Chinese gulag.

Also, the administration's policy has not succeeded in stopping China's transfer of nuclear and missile technology to Third World countries, such as Syria and Pakistan, in violation of international law.

In addition, China's hardline restrictions on emigration violate the Jackson-Vanik statute which states that MFN trade status be reserved for countries with free and open emigration policies.

Turning a blind eye to China's flagrant violations of human rights and international agreements has obviously failed to bring reform. It's time for the administration to reexamine its China policy of engagement in terms of human rights, nonproliferation, global cooperation, and free trade.

The United States should use the leverage of MFN trading status to induce China to adopt free trade and legal arms shipment policies, as well as humane policies toward its own people.

H.R. 2212 is a reasonable and realistic approach to condition MFN to China. It renews MFN for China in 1991 and sets out achievable conditions for renewal in 1992.

Enactment of this bill will impose reasonable human rights conditions, lead to more releases of political prisoners, help reformers by



enabling them to argue internally that brutal repression has its external costs and make China think twice about failing to comply with international nonproliferation agreements.

Our Nation needs to send a clear message to the Chinese Government that its cruel policy of repression is unacceptable to civilized nations.

Mr. Speaker, we can send this message by passing H.R. 2212.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt Ms. PELOSI's resolution tying the continuation of MFN treatment for China next year to several well-considered conditions dealing with its human rights, trade, and arms sales policies.

It is tempting in this debate to see China as a cohesive national entity that is subject to the conventions of Western diplomacy and influence. As much as I would like to believe it, I have over time been persuaded that such is not the case. It follows that we must deal with China in some ways which recognize that it's different; that it's not always susceptible to our logic; and, that we've got to be smart, or we won't be very effective in accomplishing our objectives.

Likewise, we have to appreciate the fact that China's economy has to a significant extent become differentiated regionally. We need to deal with the reality that the forces for political reform have tended to be coincident with the forces for economic reform and liberalization, which in turn have been concentrated in those areas where trade with the West has been concentrated.

Thus, to a degree, I buy the argument that hitting China with denial or conditioning of MFN will hurt the emerging reform elements while exerting less effective influence than we might imagine on the reactionary old guard in charge in Beijing. And so I decided, after reflection, not to vote for Mr. SOLOMON's resolution to end MFN status immediately this year, as appealing as it was to me to seek vindication for the moral outrage we all feel about the despicable way the Chinese regime has treated its people.

On the other hand, it's wise—as today's analysis by the Democratic Study Group suggests—to remind ourselves of the origins of MFN in the context of the international trading rules of market-based economies, as most clearly codified in the GATT. That is, it is in a very real sense inherently contradictory to apply the underlying premises of MFN to trade with a country that has a centralized economy where there's only the most expedient relationship between cost and price. The application of normal free-market notions of tariffs, or dumping, or the like, to trade with such an economy is awkward, at best. The DSG study rightly asks whether the unilateral granting of MFN status strengthens or weakens the world trading system.

Nonetheless, we are now constrained by recent history to proceed as if applying the concept of MFN to an economy like China's represents a legitimate policy. We can't recapture our intellectual innocence or our trade practices purity at this point.

But neither can we afford to sell our souls. First, I believe that a great deal of the credibility and influence of this Nation around the world still depends upon our remaining true to

our principles. And second, I believe that ultimately even the Chinese Government, if not the current regime, then the next, will find it necessary to respond to our legitimate diplomacy, reinforced by well-crafted economic and trade policies that seek to move it to become a more responsible member of the community of nations, and to show a greater regard for the aspirations of its own people. The Chinese Government will simply see it as in its own enlightened self-interest to do so.

I am willing, then, to take the risk of some unwanted consequences to the economic-political reformer "good guys" in order to deliver a pointed message to the economic-political reactionary "bad guys."

The Pelosi resolution does the job of performing the requisite balancing act. It can and will be refined in conference. It is the best choice we have.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to day to oppose the renewal of most favored nation trade status to the People's Republic of China. The Congress has played an active role in trade and tariff matters since the founding of the Republic. In these matters, we must maintain the right of the Congress to consider the human rights record of the countries we trade with. Our Nation stands for fundamental principles of hope, freedom, and democracy which we should actively promote in our diplomacy with other nations.

When the Chinese students in Tiananmen Square erected their own version of the Statue of Liberty, they were invoking a symbol which personifies—to the entire world—the highest ideals of our Nation. The Chinese students knew, as did Abraham Lincoln, that America's "reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere."

Mr. Speaker, most favored nation trade status for China must be evaluated against the human rights record of the government since the crackdown on Tiananmen Square. Unfortunately, the violations against human rights by Beijing have continued without even a brief pause. The rewarding of MFN 1 year ago has not moderated the behavior of the Chinese leadership.

The Government still prohibits free speech. Thousands have been arrested, and shot or sent to labor camps. The State Department has documented the use of cattle prods, electrodes, and beatings against prisoners. Some of the goods exported to the United States which received preferential trade treatment, were made by inmates in labor camps, which is a violation of U.S. law.

Most-favored-nation-trade status allows goods from an exporting country to be subject to the lowest U.S. tariffs. We should unconditionally extend this privileged treatment only to those nations who are making a significant effort to establish democratic freedoms within their borders.

Such is not the case with the Beijing leadership. They have not yet absorbed the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson when he said that "the care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring H.R. 2212, which bars MFN status for China in 1992 un-

less the President certifies that China has accounted for and released all citizens arrested, held without charges, or sentenced because of the peaceful protests surrounding the 1989 Tiananmen Square demonstrations. H.R. 2212 also requires that the President certify that China is making significant overall progress in several other human rights areas.

H.R. 2212 gives the Chinese Government an opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to basic human rights. It uses a carrot-and-stick approach to provide positive incentives for the Beijing leadership to begin the necessary reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the importance of trade with China, but we cannot have trade at any cost. Respecting our most important principles is of greater importance than economic gain. H.R. 2212 encourages the Beijing Government to respect human rights. More importantly, it sends a clear message to the freedom movement in China that we support their goals and aspirations. America, the land of hope and freedom, stands by the struggling protestors for democracy in China.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I believe revoking China's most-favored-nation status is not in our national interest, nor is placing new conditions on next year's extension in our national interest. I urge my colleagues to defeat both the Solomon disapproval resolution and the Pelosi conditionality bill.

Most favored nation is the term used to designate countries which are eligible for normal U.S. tariff rates. It is not a privileged status accorded to special friends. Imports from countries without most-favored-nation [MFN] status are subject to much higher duty rates. Rates often so high they effectively prohibit trade. All countries, except a declining number of Communist countries, have MFN status, including South Africa, Libya, Iraq, and Iran. All Western democracies currently extend MFN treatment to China.

Last year, many Members attempted to end China's MFN status in response to the tragic events in Tiananmen Square and China's restrictions on human rights. Unfortunately conditions have not improved significantly since then, and we are again faced with the same dilemma.

The debate over China's MFN status should revolve around two issues: what is in the United States interest, and what is most likely to promote positive change in China.

Continuing our trade relationship with China is in our national interest. MFN was originally extended to China in 1980 to demonstrate the benefits of trade and a more open society. Since then, China has begun to dismantle its state-controlled economy and has significantly improved its human rights conditions compared to the conditions which existed prior to 1980.

Trade has acted as a stimulus for these changes and has been the primary channel for contact with America and for the transmittal of our democratic value system. The result has been the creation of a new generation of Chinese with expectations that the current authoritarian regime cannot hope to meet.

The United States currently imposes the most stringent sanctions on China of all Western democracies. Weapons deliveries and military cooperation remain suspended; the Unit-

ed States remains opposed to World Bank loans to China; high-level exchanges have been canceled; and the President has designated China as a Special 301 country for violation of United States intellectual property rights which could lead to further trade sanctions unless China improves its copyright laws.

The Chinese Government is unlikely to change its ways to meet most of the conditions Congress will probably place on extension of MFN—conditions others in the West are unwilling to require. China would, then, effectively lose its ability to export to the United States, and would most assuredly retaliate against our trade interests. The United States currently exports 5 billion dollars' worth of goods and services such as wheat, aerospace products, computers, electronic machinery, cotton, and fertilizer. Many United States companies stand to lose a substantial amount of their investment in the Chinese market. It could also adversely affect over \$4 billion of United States direct investment in China.

Some opponents of MFN for China argue that denying China MFN will improve our trade deficit. However, eliminating our bilateral trade deficit with China by cutting off trade with China is unlikely to have any beneficial effect on our total trade deficit. The cheap, low-value products that we import from China would likely be imported from some other cheap labor country and our high-value exports are likely to be replaced by exports from other Western industrialized countries. The result would be that American businesses would lose valuable export markets and American consumers would suffer.

We were all outraged by the massacre at Tiananmen Square, and continue to oppose the notable human rights abuses in China, but denying China MFN status is not the correct response. There are other more selective, and I think more effective, measures the United States can take to put pressure on China to improve its human rights conditions and to address concerns over arms proliferation and other issues that would damage United States interests less. Moreover, it is critical to the future development of China that America continue to influence the next generation of Chinese leaders, and the best way to transmit our values of democracy and the free enterprise is through exposure to trade. For all these reasons, China's MFN status should be allowed to continue. This isn't the most popular position or a politically expedient position to take, but I believe it's the right one.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2212. It is time that we send a clear message that the United States will not ignore China's abhorrent human rights record, advanced weapons sales to countries around the world, and unfair trading practices with the United States.

The Chinese Government's brutal suppression of political dissidents is undisputed. We all recall the graphic violence and blatant disrespect for human life that took place during the government's massacre in Tiananmen Square. China has also refused to become a responsible member of the world community with regard to trade and arms control. Granting China unconditional most-favored-nation [MFN] status will only continue to reward China for its refusal to address these issues.

To those who say that cutting off MFN benefits to China will hurt United States economic interests, I ask: Are we really hurting ourselves by conditioning special trade benefits to a country that uses prison labor to produce products for international markets, and which has virtually no respect for United States copyrights and patents? China has exploited these factors to accumulate a massive trade surplus with the United States and amass huge foreign currency reserves which effectively protect it from outside pressures.

One analysis suggests that if the United States were to demand fair and balanced trade with China, our economy would have grown by as much as \$25 billion in 1990 and created an additional 400,000 jobs. Yet, despite the unfair trade practices and human rights abuses that have been documented in China over the last several years, the President is only too willing to grant to China the same trade status that we give our best trading partners. Not only is unconditional MFN status for China a slap in the face to the American principle of respect for human rights, it is a slap in the face to American workers and businesses as well.

In adopting H.R. 2212, we are putting China on notice that its MFN status is in jeopardy. At the same time, though, we give them an opportunity to take corrective action before MFN is revoked. The conditions outlined in this bill place China's MFN status in its own hands. If China makes progress on human rights, trade, and weapons proliferation, then it will be able to retain MFN status. If not, then MFN is automatically revoked.

Using MFN as leverage only works if the Chinese Government knows we are serious about taking this privilege away. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2212, and put some teeth into our relations with China by conditioning MFN status on real improvements in China's trade policies and abusive human rights practices.

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I have grave reservations regarding the wisdom of imposing conditions on the President's request to extend most-favored-nation [MFN] status to the People's Republic of China [PRC]. While reasonable men and women may differ, I believe that MFN is not an appropriate vehicle for achieving our political, social and foreign policy objectives in China. Moreover, I just don't believe that conditionality will work in this case. In fact, it is likely to be counter-productive, both in terms of improving China's internal situation and promoting America's self-interest.

Every Member of Congress has been revolted by the repression of human rights in China, beginning with the Tiananmen Square massacre and continuing to this day. The PRC's use of prison labor is most disturbing, and the repression in Tibet is a tragedy.

All our problems with China are not confined to human rights. Proliferation of nuclear and nonnuclear arms is also a major concern. The sale of ballistic missiles to Pakistan and Syria and nuclear technology to Algeria cannot be overlooked.

Finally, our bilateral trading relationship is replete with difficulties. China's trade surplus with the United States is now second only to Japan's. China completely disregards intellec-

tual property rights, and market access for United States exports is becoming more and more difficult.

With all these problems, it is only natural that we should think of revoking or imposing conditions on most-favored-nation status for China. However, the issue that we must confront is whether such action would be productive. China is *sui generis*, and what might work with other countries could backfire with China.

An historical perspective will help us assess our options. We are not dealing with a typical country, but the Middle Kingdom. How such a country, steeped in thousands of years of tradition, will respond to outside pressure, is by no means clear.

In evaluating China's susceptibility to economic pressure, we must remember that historically, China has resisted the allure of foreign trade, especially with the West. Efforts by the British, French and the Americans to open the China trade during the first half of the nineteenth century were stoutly opposed by Peking. Only by going to war were the Western Powers able to open up China for trade.

The Chinese did not willingly accept their defeat in the Anglo-Chinese War of 1839-42, which resulted in trade, albeit circumscribed, with the West. The ruling Manchu dynasty was begrudging in granting concessions to the Western trading powers. In part, this stemmed from strong domestic opposition to the Western incursions. Indeed, so great was the domestic dissatisfaction with Manchus' inability to effectively oppose foreign incursions that a revolt against the regime ensued on a scale unknown in the West, claiming millions of lives.

The dynasty survived these challenges, but embarked on a self-strengthening movement, designed to make it possible to sever all ties with the West. For many Chinese, this movement did not go far enough. The Boxer Rebellion of the late 19th century was xenophobic in character, motivated in part by the goal of modernizing the country so that China would be strong enough to break the foreign powers' domination of the country.

In 1911, China overthrew the monarchy and became a republic, but in name only. Traditions proved too powerful, and Western style democracy just did not take hold. What little support there was for democracy came from Western-educated students, many of whom had gone to school in the United States supported by remission of the Boxer Indemnity. Following the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion, the United States and the other powers imposed a huge financial indemnity on China. Some years later, the United States remitted the indemnity to educate Chinese students in the United States in order to gain the goodwill of the future leaders of China.

The Chinese Nationalists, or Kuomintang, came to power in 1927, led by Chiang K'ai-shek. To many Americans, Chiang, married to a Methodist, represented the accession of Western values in China. Nothing could be further from the truth. He was an old fashioned warlord, who proved incapable of overcoming the nationalistic appeal of the Communists, and eventually was deposed.

The year 1949 brought Mao and the Communists to power, and relations with the Unit-



ed States could not have been worse, nor China more isolated, until Richard Nixon made his dramatic visit to China over 20 years later. And, during this period of isolation, human rights abuses were perpetrated on a far greater scale than we see today.

There are some ironies here when we look back at our relations with China during the fifties and sixties. The Republican Party, led by Senator Joe McCarthy, pushed for a moralistic, hard-line China policy. Even minimal contact with China was discouraged; you broke the law just visiting China. Many Republicans argued that the largest country in the world should be completely isolated. Conversely, many Democrats recommended a more pragmatic approach, arguing that the United States should recognize reality, deal with the Chinese Communists, and hope that this contact would eventually improve their conduct. I note that we have somewhat of a role reversal today between our two great political parties.

If we condition or revoke MFN, it will lead to reduced foreign trade and contact with China. I have concluded that this will strengthen the hands of the octogenarian leadership in Beijing by playing to the strong isolationist and anti-foreign sentiment in China and will prevent the emerging mercantile class from developing into a force that can challenge the current leadership.

The entrepreneurs of southern China will find it more difficult to mount a political challenge to the hard-line Communist leadership if United States trade benefits are withdrawn. The entrepreneurs need more time to gain in strength. Only by strengthening the mercantile class and promoting further contact with the West will we achieve democracy in China.

In addition to undermining the emerging mercantile class in China, cutting off or revoking MFN will place the United States at a severe disadvantage with our trading partners. No other industrialized country is now using or contemplating the use of trade as political leverage against China. If we act to cut off MFN, we will be acting alone. History has shown that economic pressure does not work when pursued unilaterally instead of on a multilateral basis, as was done with respect to South Africa or Iraq.

There are other, more targeted options than removing most-favored-nation status available to the United States that will enable us to press our grievances without undermining the very forces of change in China that we seek to assist.

Some people believe that when faced with the loss of huge trade revenues, the Chinese will ameliorate their behavior. But Chinese history suggests that this is not likely to happen, especially if our action forces China into isolationism. Throughout its modern history, contact with the West has produced positive changes. Isolation from the West has led to greater repression and human rights abuses. Just look at the Western-educated students that formed the core of the May 4th movement in 1919 or the Democracy movement, which was crushed some 70 years later, in Tiananmen Square.

Mr. Speaker, we must be very careful in deciding our course of action. Cracking down on China might make us feel good, but will it produce the kinds of changes that are needed

in that country? We all share the same goals for China, but how do we achieve them? Not, in my judgment, by driving China into isolationism. Depriving China of trade revenues will force it to rely even more on weapons sales to generate needed revenue.

Almost a century ago, the Christian missionaries sent to China reported that the Chinese were proud, resistant to the Christian message of damnation and guilt. How resistant to conditions, sanctions really, will the Chinese be today? And, if conditions are called for, will we impose ones that can be realistically achieved? Many of the conditions contained in H.R. 2212 cannot realistically be achieved. More important, imposing any conditions at all on China will likely have just the opposite effect of what we are trying to achieve.

The preferable course of action is to continue to foster our trading relationship with China and to maintain and increase our contacts with that country. The octogenarians that lead China cannot last forever. We must be patient and not sacrifice our most promising opportunity to promote democracy in China, as well as a very significant trading relationship that supports thousands of jobs in the United States. To do otherwise would not only be short-sighted but would ignore the lessons of history, most especially Chinese history.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when this debate is over, Congress should reexamine the entire nature of MFN status. Is MFN an appropriate vehicle for achieving political, social, and diplomatic objectives? Has conditionality been an effective tool in the past for achieving our goals or has it been counterproductive? Can we reconcile giving MFN status to countries like Burma, Syria, and Iraq while denying this status to China and the Soviet Union. This debate has made it abundantly evident why the United States should develop a coherent policy regarding MFN and the use and limitations of trade as a political and diplomatic tool.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during this debate Members should know of a serious difficulty in trade relations between the United States and China.

Two U.S.-flag shipping companies provide service between our two nations. They compete with two Chinese-flag companies. This occurs pursuant to a bilateral maritime agreement signed several years ago.

Unfortunately, we continue to hear disturbing reports that China imposes severe and unfair doing-business restrictions on United States shipping lines. There are bars to United States carriers opening branch offices in China. There are impediments to our carriers collecting their lawfully filed tariffs or rates. Our carriers are prevented from conducting intermodal operations by running their own feeder vessels between Hong Kong and China.

We don't put similar restrictions on Chinese carriers doing business here. United States-flag carriers should receive fair and equal treatment while doing business in China, and our Government and this Congress should insist that they get it.

Currently, the Federal Maritime Commission has opened a formal investigation of these allegations. If the regulatory agency substantiates the charges, it can impose sanctions on Chinese shipping lines doing business in the United States.

As chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I commend the Federal Maritime Commission for its aggressive use of the Foreign Shipping Practices Act, a 1988 statute that I sponsored.

China wants to keep most-favored-nation status. President Bush wants China to have it. In return, the United States must insist that China not discriminate against our companies doing business there. China must promptly eliminate the unfair burdens it places on United States-flag shipping.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of unconditionally extending most-favored-nation treatment to the People's Republic of China.

My support for unconditional extension of MFN to the People's Republic of China in no way means I agree with or support all of that Government's policies. I do have deep concerns with China's human rights conditions, detainment of political prisoners, and family-planning practices. My past votes demonstrate these concerns. However, after carefully studying this situation, I have come to the conclusion that revoking MFN at this time is not in the best interests of the Chinese people or the American people. It has been the renewal of MFN that has granted the people of China the right to emigrate more freely. MFN has also prompted the Chinese Government to adopt more liberal foreign travel policies for its citizens. Students are now able to study and travel abroad. Other Chinese citizens have been allowed to return to China to visit friends and family and depart again without restrictions.

Furthermore, by denying MFN to the People's Republic of China, not only will the Chinese people suffer through restrictive emigration and travel policies, but they will endure economic hardships as well. The most market-oriented segments of the Chinese economy—the area the United States has worked the hardest to bolster—could be devastated. Southern China and Hong Kong, which currently enjoy strong economies based on free enterprise, could be stifled in their efforts to push for a market-driven economy. Eliminating MFN could mean these regions would fall prey to the hard-line centralist government that wants to exercise more control over enterprises in Southern China.

In addition, if MFN is not extended, American business, consumers, and agriculture will suffer. Without MFN, China would most likely retaliate against United States products and turn to other countries to meet their needs. Companies like McDonnell Douglas and Boeing would lose billions of dollars in aircraft sales; computer and electronic companies could suffer; and the U.S. agricultural industry would be set back hundreds of millions of dollars. Currently, China is one of the largest markets for United States agricultural products. We should be looking for ways to boost our farmers' incomes instead of taking away from them.

I believe the best way to approach China and achieve favorable results is to remain engaged, through MFN, with the PRC. Since 1980, when most-favored-nation treatment was first granted to China, international trade and investment have served as the catalyst for promoting reform in China. Through MFN, the

United States will have an active presence which offers an avenue to promote the American values of freedom and democracy, and the ideals which accompany them.

The United States currently has an agenda to address human rights, arms control, and other issues of concern. The Bush administration has achieved favorable results through their program. I believe Congress should allow the President to continue pushing for change along these lines, and grant unconditional MFN to China in order to promote the best interests of Chinese and American citizens alike.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 2212, the Pelosi bill on MFN for China. Conditional MFN is our best leverage to get China to improve its record on human rights and nuclear and missile proliferation.

I am especially concerned about proliferation. China has sold nuclear weapons technology to countries all over the world. During the 1980's, the People's Republic of China sold: uranium-enrichment technology to Pakistan and Iraq, nuclear-weapons design to Pakistan, beginning in 1983, a nuclear reactor to Algeria too big for research and too small to generate power reliably, important nuclear equipment, materials, and technology to Iran, North Korea, India, South Africa, Argentina, and Brazil.

China also supplied many of these countries with missile technology as well. They are currently delivering M-11 missiles to Pakistan and are negotiating to sell M-9 missiles to Syria. Both of these are nuclear-capable missiles with ranges that exceed MTCR limits.

Under the Pelosi bill, the President can only renew MFN if he certifies that China is not contributing to nuclear and missile proliferation and is adhering to the MTCR export control guidelines on nuclear capable missiles.

The existing sanctions address foreign companies which sell missile technology—they are less effective when a Communist government is selling missiles. And, there are no sanctions for foreign companies or governments that sell nuclear-weapons technology.

These conditions can be met. China sells nuclear and missile technology to raise hard currency. Losing MFN will cost China billions of dollars in hard currency. This is a calculus China's leaders can understand.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of H.R. 2212. I commend the gentlelady from California, Congresswoman PELOSI, for introducing this legislation and the other sponsors for their leadership on this initiative.

Given the events of the past year, such as the continuing human rights violations in China, the sale of ballistic missile technology to Pakistan, the skyrocketing United States trade deficit with China, and China's export of prison-made goods to the United States, China appears to no longer warrant MFN.

President Bush has decided to extend China's most-favored-nation trade status for another year. The human rights situation in China has not improved, if anything, the situation has gotten demonstrably worse—labor camps continue to grow, Chinese citizens continue to languish in prisons without charge or trial, and security police continue to occupy press offices.

The President has stated that conditions in China are better than they were in 1975. However, the administration failed to mention that they are worse than they were in 1978, when, for a short time, Chinese citizens enjoyed greater freedom than they do today. To harken back to the end of the Cultural Revolution, one of the worst periods in China's recent history, is to set the lowest possible point of reference by which to measure human right gains in China.

Mr. Speaker, in truth, what is taking place in China today has been going on for decades—forced labor is nothing new, China sold billions of dollars worth of nuclear and missile technology around the world during the 1980's, and China never respected intellectual property rights or basic human rights.

Anything less than strong economic pressure will result in more meaningless gestures from the repressive regime in Beijing. China will not change its policies unless it is induced by the strongest possible means, which in this case is the repeal of MFN. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2212.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been united in expressing horror over the events which took place in Tiananmen Square 2 years ago, and the wave of repression that has since followed in China. Where we have not all agreed, however, is on the best approach to take in order to improve the human-rights climate in China. I rise today in strong support of Representative PELOSI's bill, because I think her approach of applying strong conditions to the renewal of most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status provides the best way for this country to continue to press the leadership in China for reform, especially in the area of human rights.

China has enjoyed unconditional and uninterrupted MFN status since 1980; yet China's egregious record on human rights, arms proliferation, and unfair trading practices has not improved, even after the international outcry over Tiananmen Square 2 years ago. So I do not see how it can be argued that taking a business-as-usual approach and renewing MFN status unconditionally is going to get us anywhere.

In the area of human rights, the Chinese record remains dismal. In the aftermath of the massacre in Tiananmen Square, an estimated 1,000 democracy and reform advocates were killed, and thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, were imprisoned. Most recently, Amnesty International's 1991 report notes:

Hundreds of prisoners of conscience remained in prison throughout 1990, including many detained without charge or trial. There were many new arrests of political and religious activists, advocates of Tibetan independence and others. Torture of detainees by police and harsh conditions of detention continued to be reported. A dramatic increase in the number of death sentences and executions was recorded \*\*\*.

Further, China remains the only major nuclear power which refuses to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and continues to assist nations such as Pakistan, India, Algeria, and others in developing nuclear-weapons capabilities. This reckless disregard for the international regime to contain nuclear proliferation must be condemned in the strongest possible

terms by the United States. China is still not a party to the Missile Control Technology Regime. Clearly MFN status, which provides the Chinese with \$3 to \$6 billion in foreign currency earnings, provides our Nation with substantial leverage over Chinese proliferation policies. Chinese exports to the United States are reported to bring to China three times as much hard currency as arms sales since 1983.

In yet another area, United States-China trade involved \$20 billion in exchange in 1990—\$15.2 billion in imports from China, and only \$4.8 billion in exports to China. This \$10.4 billion trade deficit is the third largest for the United States. Our trade deficit with China has grown for 6 consecutive years. Reportedly, a good share of this deficit is fueled by the use of prison labor for export production, trade barriers, and a lack of respect for U.S. intellectual property rights.

Finally, on the longstanding problem of freedom for the people of Tibet, our country must insist that Beijing recognize the rights of all Tibetans to express themselves politically and religiously. When Congress received the Dalai Lama a few months ago, he maintained that during the 40 years of Chinese rule in Tibet, an estimated 1.2 million Tibetans have died at the hands of the Chinese, and over 6,000 monasteries and temples have been destroyed.

In summary, by conditioning MFN we provide the Chinese leadership with clear incentives to pursue reform in the areas which deeply concern us. At the same time, by conditioning rather than revoking MFN, we have not isolated those whom we seek to support within China. If we are simply going to cut off trade at this point, we are not likely to achieve improvement in China. Those elements in China who are likely to be the most reformist are in fact those elements that through trade have the most exposure to the world at large. If we totally cut ourselves off from those forces by revoking MFN, it seems to me we do a disservice rather than a service to the cause of reform within Communist China.

In closing, while this is a complicated issue, we must make a choice, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Pelosi legislation conditioning MFN. I appeal to the President to review his opposition to this thoughtful and measured approach.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the bill crafted by Ms. PELOSI and others, H.R. 2212, the disapproval of most-favored-nation status for China for 1992. As a cosponsor of this important legislation I am particularly interested in seeing its immediate passage and if necessary, a successful veto override.

Successful and profitable trade relationships between the United States and other countries are an intrinsic part of the U.S. economy and require special attention and nurturing. I believe trade preferences, like MFN, should not be awarded carelessly and should reflect the U.S. commitment to democratic ideals.

Our foreign policy stance has traditionally been to foster democratic growth abroad and when democratic ideas have been threatened or subverted in any way, we have always been extremely critical. In the interest of maintaining a consistent and successful foreign



policy, we cannot grant most-favored-nation status to China. Tiananmen Square, coercive abortion practices, the jailing of political dissidents, forced prison labor and a host of other reasons clearly demonstrate that China is not tolerating democratic change and is in fact squashing any resistance to the status quo.

The conditions for MFN for China set forth in the Pelosi bill are not outrageous by any means. They are logical, humane, and democracy fostering ideas that, if adopted, could do a great deal to encourage China to rethink its current practices. Further they are aimed at closing the \$10 billion trade deficit we have with the People's Republic of China.

This body has already approved one questionable trade bill in passing the fast track legislation earlier this year. I hope we will be more careful when considering approval of MFN for China for 1992.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, President Bush and the Chinese Government have told us that continued trade between our two countries is essential if we are to work together in other areas. Supporters of most-favored-nation status have told us that we will be more successful in our relations with China by encouraging democracy through continued trade.

We have tried that approach, it has failed, and the time has come to stand up for American principles and American jobs. The time has come to disapprove most-favored-nation status for China by passing House Joint Resolution 263. This bill does not end trade altogether, it merely takes away preferred trading status.

It is true that some of the people in China who trade with us favor democracy and capitalism more than the Communist leadership. However, their influence has not made any significant change in the human rights conditions in China in the 2 years since the bloody massacre at Tiananmen Square.

It puzzles me that President Bush asks us to cut off family planning funds for the entire world that are administered by the U.N. Population Fund because China forces many women to have abortions, yet when the Chinese killed and imprisoned democracy activists he rewards them by extending trade preferences. What is to stop the Chinese from funding the abortion program out of the profits from their \$10 billion trade surplus with the United States?

Similarly, I am sure that there are plenty of capitalist minded people in Cuba who would love to do business with us and show their fellow Cubans the advantages of free enterprise, but we have an embargo against trade with Cuba. What principle justifies such favorable treatment for China?

A few United States companies are making a nice profit on their business in China, but many more companies are being wiped out by unfair competition from Chinese imports. Chinese products are sometimes built by prison labor, sometimes labeled as being produced elsewhere, and never produced in a situation where free market competition for raw materials, labor rates, and other business costs is reflected in the final price.

When American textile workers and other workers lose their jobs to Chinese sweatshops, it is not because they can not compete,

its is because our leaders and our trade officials are not standing up for American principles and American jobs.

Our trade deficit with China was over \$10 billion last year, and it will be significantly higher this year. Meanwhile, the Chinese seem to be punishing us for Tiananmen Square, as United States exports to China have actually dropped over the past 2 years.

Our colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, has wisely recognized that the time has come to back up our words with actions. I believe that his bill, House Joint Resolution 263, is the best approach.

I would also like to recognize the dedication of Congresswoman PELOSI and her work on this issue as well as that of Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. PEASE. Their bill, H.R. 2212, makes an important contribution to the debate by proposing to extend MFN status for a year and then linking further extensions to human rights standards.

However, I do not believe that the basic assumptions of H.R. 2212 are realistic. If that is the case, the only difference between the Pelosi bill and the Solomon bill is that under H.R. 2212, China has another year to profit from yet another huge trade surplus, and American workers must face another year of unfair competition from China.

Mr. Speaker, we have given economic cooperation a chance. The time has come to take up the cause of those who held up a model of our Statue of Liberty as their emblem and to part company with those who smashed it to pieces.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today, President Bush removed economic sanctions against South Africa and announced his firm support for unconditional trade with China. At a time when human rights and democratic reform should be the backbone of U.S. foreign policy, the President has moved to undermine every moral principle that U.S. policy is built upon for short run political gain.

Despite Beijing's willingness to punish peaceful dissent, the President continues to support China's MFN status. Despite its spread of nuclear technology, the administration has not swayed from sponsoring China's access to United States markets. And despite China's use of prison labor to manufacture exports, the administration is willing to make it easier for China to sell those products to American consumers.

From Ethiopia to Eastern Europe, the United States has conditioned continued relations on human rights, free elections and democratic rule. But for China, this administration has allowed tyranny to go unchecked. Despite the death of the Warsaw Pact and the disarray of the Soviet Union, the administration continues to hold tightly to the China card.

Today we have the opportunity to reverse that policy. By supporting the Pelosi bill, we can condition MFN on ending Chinese nuclear proliferation, torture, and religious persecution. By supporting the Pelosi bill, we can require Beijing to open secret trials, allow freedom of speech and improve prison conditions. And by accepting the Pelosi language, we can condition future trade on China's adherence to the Joint Hong Kong Declaration.

Condition MFN and we renew U.S. moral authority to the world. Condition MFN and we

can add new value to the China card. Condition MFN and we renew our commitment to the Chinese people.

Last year we were assured that China would take steps to improve its policies. But today we stand here to recognize that those policies have only worsened. Clearly, the Chinese Government can no longer be trusted to keep its word.

If we are serious about our commitment to human rights, freedom and democracy, then we should be serious about holding China responsible for its actions. If we are serious about promoting responsible trade relations that actually make a difference, then support the Pelosi bill. If we are serious about the new world order, then conditioning trade is a fundamental part of any future policy.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, today the House again considers most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status with the People's Republic of China. Trade under MFN represents a long-standing principle of cooperation in commerce to benefit both trading partners. It is an outreach of international relations among nations.

This nondiscriminatory trade treatment is a privilege the U.S. grants to nations which practice internationally accepted standards of conduct. MFN status is afforded to nations which respect human rights and basic freedoms, adhere to international agreements and conduct nonrestrictive trade.

China has flagrantly violated these norms. Its history of human rights abuses, the reported proliferation of nuclear weapons and technology, and unauthorized occupation of the nation of Tibet have breached accepted international standards and provoked outcry from the world community. By granting unconditional MFN status, the United States would indirectly condone China's unacceptable practices. MFN status should not be renewed until and unless China's abuses are corrected.

The brutal and bloody suppression of prodemocracy advocates in Tiananmen Square two summers ago has not been forgotten. Despite international pressure, the Chinese Government has not acted to improve its human rights record. We continue to receive reports of torture, religious persecution, imprisonment without charge or trial, and harassment of Chinese citizens presently in the United States.

The U.S. must respond, and can do so effectively through trade policy. However, under the administration's trade policy since the Tiananmen massacre, the only success we have seen is China's success at increasing the United States trade deficit. The United States trade deficit with China was over \$10 billion in 1990, and it continues to increase this year. We must not appease China.

For these reasons, I urge you to deny MFN trade status to China in 1991, and support the legislation introduced by the gentlewoman from California, [Ms. PELOSI], which makes MFN for China in 1992 conditional on improvements in numerous human rights matters discussed here today. H.R. 2212, as amended, addresses the human rights, arms control, and trade concerns which demand improvements. It is worthy of our support.

Mr. Speaker, it is time this Nation sends a message to China by using its trade leverage. It is the best way to summon a response from

them on these important international concerns.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to both resolutions today which would deny or place conditions on most-favored-nation status for China. I do so not because I believe that China's human rights, trade, and arms proliferation records are admirable, but because I believe these resolutions will not achieve their desired results.

Everyone in this body agrees that China has committed atrocities in the area of human rights, and our reaction today is understandable. We are all outraged by what happened to students and citizens in Beijing during the Tiananmen crackdown in 1989. We also should not and cannot tolerate forced labor in concentration camps. Congress wants to do something and should do something. The question is what we do; the means by which we achieve it; and what is the result of our action. I believe that we already have the necessary and required means to begin to address each one of our concerns in China, whether it be utilizing "Super 301" enforcement provisions for unfair trade practices, or insisting that China join the missile technology control regime to address arms proliferation.

China remains today one of the most dogmatic and rigidly Communist societies in the world. The Chinese Government is still ruled by an informal confederation of elders that practice an old school style of communism. This point was brought dramatically to light when the first open expressions of democratic rebellion appeared in the streets of Beijing. When it appeared that the central government was threatened, the reaction of the Chinese leadership was swift and brutal.

Some would argue that this is the very reason that we must deny MFN status to the Chinese. They must be taught a lesson. However, I believe that an outright denial of MFN, or the placing of unrealistic conditions upon that status, might have precisely the opposite effect.

It is true that Congress has a rich tradition in safeguarding human rights for people everywhere by promoting democracy and defending liberty abroad. However, we will best preserve the rights of China's millions of people by voting to extend MFN status for another year. The democratic spirit is alive and continuing to percolate in China, albeit below the surface. Particularly in China's southern provinces, the progress of entrepreneurial efforts and industrialization is critical to the ability of the United States to influence events through our cooperative industrial efforts. Southern China has been indelibly infected with a thirst for free market business endeavors. In addition, many political freedoms have been extended to a growing number of Chinese citizens. Having visited this region in 1988, I have witnessed some of this metamorphosis.

These developments are the real harbingers of democracy in China, and they need our help to continue. Their proponents do not deserve to be deserted when the central government in Beijing is, by many accounts, in a period of serious retrenchment. The resolutions before us today may well only punish those who hope to encourage China's growth and increasing democratization through capitalism. We must proceed slowly so as not to hurt the very people we hope to help—those within the

government who are pushing for free market reform and a more open democratic society.

These resolutions could have precisely the opposite effect claimed by their sponsors—they could strengthen hard-liners in China who want to distance that country from the United States, they might further isolate China in the world community, and cause China to move backwards on human rights. Without trade and economic links to the United States, including very important exchanges between the two countries which encourage exposure of an increasing number of Chinese to American democracy, the aging Chinese leadership could continue to become isolated and less inclined to address human rights and other concerns. Alternatively, we can extend MFN for 1 year and continue to press for our concerns. If the situation does not improve in China, we can always re-visit this issue after applying the "carrots and sticks" that we currently have in our diplomatic and economic arsenals. It also should be noted that we currently extend MFN status to over 100 nations. We should not apply unfair and unrealistic standards to MFN with China selectively.

Finally, we must consider carefully the implications of this action on United States businesses, our overall trade balance, and our future trade relationships in the Pacific rim area. United States exports to China create jobs in the United States aircraft, machinery, and other industries, as well as provide markets for United States agricultural products such as fertilizer, cotton, and wheat. Our farmers should not be forced to bear continued hardships because of the use of food and commerce as leverage points with China. Furthermore, if the United States cuts off MFN to China, these exports—and the United States jobs they create—will go to United States competitors in Japan, West Germany, and other Western nations—nations which continue to provide MFN status to China.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the measures before us today are unrealistic in their expectations, and that they will only encourage China to slip further back from reform into the abyss of communism. I urge my colleagues to renew MFN for China for an additional year, and give the President's program of very specifically targeted sanctions and rigorous trade enforcement measures time to work.

I ask unanimous consent that a Wall Street Journal article be entered into the RECORD:

CHINA'S ENTREPRENEURS ARE THRIVING IN SPITE OF POLITICAL CRACKDOWN

(By James McGregor)

GUANGZHOU, CHINA.—Listen to the divergent sounds of the new China, the one born in the aftermath of the Tiananmen Square massacre two years ago.

At the New Brightness Flower Garden Night Club in this southern city, a young man in jeans and a black leather jacket mockingly sings Maoist revolutionary ballads to a disco beat. He brushes his waistlength hair back as he launches into the old Mao tune "I Love Beijing's Tiananmen." The audience laughs, relishing the irony. Nearby, people gather in noisy restaurants to discuss business, celebrate a family milestone or talk openly with foreigners. The city is alive with enterprise and ideas.

Switch now to Beijing, 1,200 miles to the north, the seat of government and well-

spring of Communist ideology. Here, Communist Party leaders intone well-worn political slogans and jail anyone who speaks his mind. The People's Daily newspaper, the party's mouthpiece, publishes ponderous essays on topics like whether to address women as "Miss" or "Comrade." Nightlife is virtually absent, talk with foreign journalists is fearfully avoided and the only Chinese patronizing the better restaurants are the government elite, dining at government expense.

#### SHIFTING POWER

This is the split personality that has emerged in China since government troops gunned down the nation's democracy movement on June 4, 1989. The elderly Marxist ideologues who rose to lead the country after Tiananmen failed to turn back the clock in the southern city of Guangzhou and other free-wheeling coastal areas as they had hoped. Instead, by dithering over political ideology and failing to devise clear economic policies, they have unwittingly handed much of the initiative for the nation's development to pragmatic leaders in China's provinces and larger cities. By focusing on political repression and propaganda campaigns. Beijing's top leaders are in some ways making themselves irrelevant.

"The agenda is being set by the provinces," says David Shambaugh, a professor of Chinese politics at the University of London, who is now in Beijing conducting research. "The center is trying to keep up with the political and economic realities of what is going on outside of Beijing and then turning around and trying to seize the reform mantle as their own."

A senior Communist Party official in central China puts it more bluntly: "Beijing, Beijing, who has time to listen to Beijing? I've got lots of problems, and Beijing doesn't offer me solutions."

#### LOST MOMENTUM

Before Tiananmen Square, Beijing bubbled with ideas. Zhao Ziyang, the former party chief who was deposed by conservatives during the demonstrations, had formed think tanks and let many others do the same. Researchers studied Europe, Japan and America looking for ways to make China's government more stable and effective. Beijing's universities churned out a blizzard of reports on free markets, foreign management techniques, modern banking and Western social-welfare systems—all in the hope of transforming China and pulling it from its troubled past.

In contrast, the new party chief, Jiang Zemin, is busy these days visiting police stations and military posts to enlist help in "building an ideological Great Wall to resist peaceful evolution." "Peaceful evolution" is the leadership's term for what it sees as a Western plot to subvert communism by infecting it with capitalist and democratic ideas.

At the same time, Premier Li Peng, representing the old-guard hard-liners, is trying to revive state-owned factories, two-thirds of which are losing money. His latest endeavor is investing \$105 billion in new equipment over the next five years while training "socialist entrepreneurs" who will "rely on the leadership of the party to bring out the enthusiasm and creativity of workers and staff members."

To be sure, the government is allowing some Beijing thinkers who were generating pre-Tiananmen reforms to tinker at the edges of economic policy. The government has enacted some price reforms and devalued the Chinese yuan. And there are renewed



plans to allow some people in urban centers to buy their homes.

But the changes are tentative and incremental. Many of Beijing's most capable researchers either have left the country or are keeping their heads down. "They still waste our time at political-study sessions, but nobody pays attention," says a middle-aged writer who is trying to get a visa to the U.S. for his daughter. "Everybody just goes through the motions, even the party people who are in charge."

Instead, people looking for innovative discussion generally look outside the capitol. This apparently includes even the aging leader Deng Xiaoping. After he visited Shanghai recently, the city's *Liberation Daily* published articles, believed ordered by Mr. Deng, that constituted the first public call for bold economic change since Tiananmen.

#### GOING LOCAL

Two months later, a conference to study Mr. Deng's philosophy of economic pragmatism was convened not in Beijing, but in Chengdu, the remote capitol of Sichuan Province. A group of European and Hong Kong financiers have launched a new \$39 million China venture capital fund that has by-laws limiting its investments to China's coast, where the financiers can deal with local governments.

"It's not that we want to bypass the central government, but if we work with local governments we can get things done," says Frank Tsui, director of the venture, China Assets Management Ltd.

Just about anywhere one travels in China—from the northeastern province of Liaoning, where the smokestacks of aged state factories have gone cold, to the rural southwestern province of Sichuan, where tiny farm plots can't keep the huge population employed—local government leaders have adopted a common survival technique. For their own protection, they keep an ear cocked toward Beijing to pick up the latest political gossip. But their attention is focused on China's coast, where foreign investors and export-oriented factories are giving Chinese workers a better standard of living.

"Local government and party leaders listen to Beijing as much as they have to and then they do the practical things necessary to improve the lives of people they are responsible for," says a Guangdong Province businessman, who is close to local officials. "The leadership, no matter how much they want to turn things back, is pulled along by the momentum of reform."

#### LOOKING SOUTH

Over the past two years, Guangdong and its capital Guangzhou, or Canton, have risen ever-higher as a symbol of China's future, just as Beijing has come to represent its past. It is difficult to find a local government leader in China who isn't trying to emulate this prosperous province, which abuts Hong Kong.

The numbers tell why. Guangdong is the site of 13,320 projects involving foreign investment, about half of all such projects in China. With this \$13 billion in foreign capital, Guangdong has built a manufacturing machine that exported \$10.5 billion worth of goods last year, about 17% of China's total.

Per-capita income here is almost double the national average, and bank deposits in the province are swelling. Building walls are covered with ads for consumer products, not communist slogans. And companies here motivate workers with profits and material in-

centives, not dogma about selfless socialist enthusiasm.

Beijing is leaving Guangdong and other coastal areas alone largely because it is hooked on the export revenue these islands of enterprise bring in. Exports from China reached 19% of the gross national product in 1990, up from 12% in 1988, the year before Tiananmen. When Mr. Deng first launched reforms in 1978, exports accounted for only 4% of GNP. China's economy has become so dependent on exports that the debate under way in Washington this week over whether to continue the most-favored-nation trade status for China is looming large here. If the favorable tariff arrangement should be withdrawn, as many in Congress want, China's already-fragile economy could be sent into a tailspin.

#### BUDGET DRAIN

Economists say China's non-state factories, which are its export engine, last year accounted for 70% of the nation's industrial growth. While the coastal provinces where these factories are situated are flush with cash, Beijing is projecting a \$10 billion budget deficit for the central government this year. Almost one-third of the government's budget goes to providing price subsidies for urban consumers and propping up money-losing state industries. Production from those state-run factories grew by only 2.9% last year. At the same time, the output of enterprises involving foreign investment jumped 56%.

Two years after the Tiananmen bloodshed, China has become so dependent on exports and foreign investment that Beijing has little choice but to continue courting foreign investors and private entrepreneurs—the very forces it worries may ultimately destroy the party's grip on power.

"Even during the turmoil I was not scared; I figured it was impossible for the country to turn back," says Huang Quan, a Guangzhou entrepreneur who employs 38 people in a private factory producing jade pendants. "I believe the government had to think, 'If we change the policy, where will all of these people work?'"

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2212, which establishes conditions on the granting of most-favored-nation status to the People's Republic of China in 1992. I want to take this opportunity to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who in conjunction with Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. PEASE introduced this intelligent and thoughtful legislation. H.R. 2212 crafts a reasonable compromise between those who would want to extend MFN status to China unconditionally, and those who argue for denial of MFN status immediately.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget the Tiananmen Square massacre or the Chinese government's brutal suppression of student protestors. Rather, we must answer the Chinese peoples cry for freedom and democracy by continuing to press for adherence to international human rights standards. H.R. 2212 permits most-favored-nation trade status for China in 1991, but establishes a number of conditions for the granting of MFN trade status in 1992.

Under H.R. 2212, the President must certify that China has accounted for and released those citizens who were arrested, held without being charged, or sentenced because of the peaceful protests in Tiananmen Square in support of democratic reforms. Also, the Presi-

dent must certify that China is making significant overall progress toward the lifting of press restrictions; the prevention of torture and inhumane prison conditions; an end to intimidation and harassment of Chinese citizens in the United States; and curbing gross human rights violations, especially in Tibet.

In addition to these human rights conditions, H.R. 2212 includes additional conditions which the President must certify before MFN status can be granted for 1992. These additional conditions include: the cessation of the export of goods produced by forced prison labor; assurances that China is not assisting non-nuclear nations in acquiring or developing nuclear weapons; and ending the practice of coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization.

All of the conditions embodied in H.R. 2212 are reasonable standards which we should expect any nation wishing to acquire most-favored-nation trading status to satisfy. H.R. 2212 also provides China with a full year to make progress toward the satisfaction of these conditions before jeopardizing their trade status with the United States. Certainly no one could argue that the language of H.R. 2212 would impose too heavy a burden on the Chinese Government, or that the conditions are unduly harsh.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2212 is a fair and just bill which allows China the opportunity to reform their conduct, and make progress toward internationally recognized standards of human rights, without being punished. If there is no progress toward the goals established in this bill in China after a full year, then the denial of further favorable trade status will convey the message to the Chinese Government that their conduct will not be tolerated by the international community. I strongly urge all my colleagues to take a stand for human rights, and vote for passage of H.R. 2212.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2212, which would permit the extension of most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status for the remainder of 1991, but which would bar MFN status in 1992 unless the President certifies to Congress that China has met certain important conditions.

Specifically, the President would be required to certify that China has accounted for and released all persons who were arrested, held without being charged, or sentenced to prison because of their participation in the peaceful protests surrounding the 1989 demonstrations in Tiananmen Square. The President would also have to certify that China is making significant overall progress to prevent gross violations of human rights, including against Tibetans removing press restrictions; ending intimidation and harassment of Chinese citizens in the United States; granting access by humanitarian and human rights groups to prisoners, their trials, and places of detention; and ending bans on peaceful demonstrations.

An additional en bloc amendment offered by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, would also establish a few additional important conditions. The President would have to further certify that China has taken steps to prevent the export of goods to the United States made with prison labor; that China is not assisting nonnuclear countries in acquiring or developing nuclear weapons directly or indirectly; and that China has

ended its programs of coerced abortions or involuntary sterilization.

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans and millions more around the world will recall the unforgettable image on our television screens after the weeks of vigil when finally the peaceful demonstrators who stood were met with tanks and guns which crushed the democracy movement in 1989. These individuals came to symbolize the courage of thousands of Chinese who protested peacefully for a more open and just society. The response of the Chinese Government was not to engage the demonstrators in meaningful dialog about compromise or democratization. Instead, the Chinese leadership after some artful dodging opted to commit force and the resulting deaths occurred on the streets of Beijing. Hundreds were killed as the world watched in horror. Thousands more fled for their lives. A few of the fortunate ones escaped from China and are living in exile around the world continuing to work for the day when China will be free from such tyranny.

The response of the Bush administration since 1989 has been to pursue a failed policy of accommodation with the Chinese leadership. For the past 2 years, President Bush has maintained and now seeks to renew China's MFN trade status while working to waive or weaken every significant military or economic sanction which Congress has sought to impose on China to modify its policies.

What has the Bush administration's policy of accommodation with the Chinese leadership gained? Instead of promoting moderation, it has emboldened the Chinese Government to become more repressive than ever.

China's record on human rights is one of the most deplorable in the world today. Major international human rights groups, such as Asia Watch and Amnesty International, have documented literally hundreds of cases of gross violations of human rights. Thousands of prodemocracy demonstrators have been shot, forced into labor camps, or have simply disappeared with no further trace. Even the State Department itself has documented the use of cattle prods, electrodes, and beatings against Chinese prisoners. China's policy of coerced abortions and forced sterilizations is contrary to any minimal standards of decency and respect for human rights and life.

There is no free emigration in China today. Emigration is strictly controlled and those most desperate to leave have no realistic opportunity of doing so.

China's export of nuclear technology and missiles continues unabated. Despite promises made to National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft during his secret visit to Beijing only weeks after the Tiananmen Square massacre, China has not stopped or reduced its missile sales to the Middle East, including Iraq. China continues to refuse to permit international inspection of its nuclear weapons facilities.

Finally, the record shows that China has enjoyed a trade windfall from having MFN status while the United States has been denied the access to the Chinese market that it deserves. Meanwhile, U.S. jobs have disappeared in clothing, textiles, and other industries.

Since 1982, China has had consistent trade surpluses with the United States. During the past decade, China's trade surplus with the

United States increased from \$2.1 billion in 1980 to \$10.4 billion last year. Since 1989, Chinese exports to the United States have nearly doubled, while United States exports to China have actually fallen. China's trade surplus with the United States is now second only to our adverse balance with Japan. Indeed, China appears to have targeted the United States market as Chinese exports to the United States have increased more than 700 percent since 1980, while their exports to the rest of the world have only increased by 56 percent.

This consistent and growing trade surplus has allowed China to amass huge United States currency reserves which, along with continuing limitations on United States entry into the Chinese market, have cost American jobs. By one estimate, if United States trade with China were on an equal footing, a half a million new United States jobs would be created.

Mr. Speaker, the conditions in H.R. 2212 are very reasonable, are in the U.S. national interest, and most importantly, such conditions are totally achievable if China makes the commitment to do so. Indeed, the bill gives China another full year to comply with such conditions. China's leadership has it within its own power to determine now whether MFN status will continue to be extended beyond next year. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 2212.

□ 1510

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

DISAPPROVING THE EXTENSION OF MFN TREATMENT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Pursuant to section 2 of H.R. 189, it is now in order to consider House Joint Resolution 263.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to H.R. 189, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 263) disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of the People's Republic of China.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 263

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Congress does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on May 29, 1991, with respect to the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 189, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 263 would rescind China's most-favored-nation [MFN] status, effective 60 days after enactment. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Members who support House Joint Resolution 263 will argue today that the United States must send a clear and unmistakable signal to the Chinese leadership—that civilized people find China's behavior in the area of human rights, and many of its foreign policy actions, to be unacceptable. I fully agree. But voting for House Joint Resolution 263 is not the proper way to send that signal.

A vote to cut off China's MFN status is a vote to cut off all potential influence by the United States over Chinese behavior. I will be the first to admit that we have not been as successful as any of us would like in bringing about improvements in China's behavior in recent years. However, I believe that our best hope for influencing Chinese behavior in the future is to remain engaged in trade with China now. We have been able to gain the release of some prisoners. We have been able, for the first time, to draw China into discussions about limiting arms transfers to the Middle East. What would have been the situation if the United States had severed its most important trade ties with China? Would China have cooperated in the United Nations' efforts to mount a coalition force against Iraqi aggression? The answer is clearly "no."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to vote to return China to its isolationist past. Such an action would only play into the hands of China's hard-line leaders, who would love nothing more than to see their western-oriented provinces and their people brought back under central control.

Later today, Members will have the opportunity to vote on the Pelosi bill which establishes tough new conditions that China must meet in order to qualify for a continuation of most-favored-nation status in 1992. That bill sends a strong message to China's leaders, but keeps the door open to important contacts and improved relations with the Chinese people.

I urge my colleagues to oppose House Joint Resolution 263.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me also thank the committee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] and the Ways and Means Committee for reporting my bill to the floor.

I speak today with a conscious sense of how improbable this moment might be.

Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House has carried more water for the Reagan administration and the Bush



administration than I have over the last 11 years, but I must rise today in opposition to the proposal to renew most-favored-nation treatment for the Communist People's Republic of China.

The resolution before us, House Joint Resolution 263, which I introduced with a bipartisan group of 16 cosponsors, would overturn President Bush's recommendation of May 29 that most-favored-nation trade status for China be renewed for another year. China's MFN status would be terminated the day this joint resolution is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I do not offer this joint resolution lightly, but I do offer it as a way of making an essential point. Our country does not owe most-favored-nation status to any country, much less to a country with a nonmarket economy.

Our first concern should always be to demonstrate that there are tangible rewards for those countries that embrace freedom around this world. At a time when China is not moving toward reform in either its politics or its economy, and at a time when China is taking no substantive steps to open its own markets to American products, why should China be enjoying a \$10 billion trade surplus against the United States? That annual trade surplus in China's favor is now moving toward \$15 billion, the second largest such deficit in the world, the first being our trade deficit with—who do you think? Japan.

What has China done in return for the benefits that MFN brings? Here is what they have done, Mr. Speaker:

Certainly we all know that hundreds, probably thousands, of Chinese citizens remain in detention throughout the country and they have no prospect of ever receiving a free, a fair, or an open trial. Now we learn that prisons and labor camps are the source of exports that are coming into this country.

Read the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times. Goods produced by slave labor are coming into this country right now today, this very moment.

We know that political indoctrination has been reintroduced as standard fare in Chinese schools. We know the rights of college students, particularly, and all citizens generally to leave the country have been curtailed, almost eliminated altogether.

Jackson-Vanik, Mr. Speaker, the law of the land here in America is regularly violated in China. We know the subjugation of Tibet continues without a letup.

What an irony it is that our country has just fought a war over the very same principle that is at stake in Tibet right now: the right of a small country to live in peace and be free from the intimidation of a larger neighbor that covets its resources.

Just last week, Mr. Speaker, a prominent Catholic bishop in China was arrested, evidently in retaliation for the Pope having appointed a new cardinal

to serve the needs of Catholic believers in China.

Another article that appeared in the Los Angeles Times and the New York Times says that executed prisoners in China now have their kidneys being sold in other parts of the world. What kind of human rights are these, particularly in a Chinese culture where the entire body is revered and means so much at burial time?

Then we consider China's continued flaunting of international norms, its ongoing sales of missiles and nuclear technology to other countries without any regard for international safeguards and inspection procedures. Chinese sales of ballistic missiles to just about every belligerent state in the Middle East have been well known for years, played up on the papers every day in recent weeks. On top of all this we have learned in recent days of Chinese sales of nuclear technology to Algeria, and possibly Iran. Where in the world is that going to lead to down the road?

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, this picture is as clear as it is ugly. The Chinese leadership functions as a law unto itself. The Chinese leadership functions as if it enjoys immunity against the tidal wave of freedom that began sweeping across the globe in the 1980's.

Mr. Speaker, an unconditional renewal of MFN, as the administration has recommended, can only serve to reinforce the illusions under which the Chinese leadership operates today. It can only serve to reinforce their attitude that they can write their own rules and do whatever they want to.

Mr. Speaker, MFN status was first extended to China 11 years ago, over my no vote. At the same time, this Congress made a conscious decision to withhold such status from another Communist nation called the Soviet Union. A policy of firmness and the persistent application of pressure against the Soviet Union have resulted in the collapse of communism in that country, and the Warsaw Pact nations, and all over the world, except in China.

Mr. Speaker, we should do no less when it comes to China. Let us not forget that the Chinese Government is a vicious Communist dictatorship, and we have no business being a partner in keeping these thugs propped up in power, which is what we are doing.

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, by citing an editorial from the New York Times dated April 26, 1991. The editorial takes note of the compelling evidence that China has an active policy of using labor camps for the manufacture of export items destined for markets in the United States, Germany, and Japan.

Extending trade privileges to a gulag economy offends the most basic American values.

And the editorial concludes by saying:

For the past decade, China has been granted waivers on the reasoning that growing

trade relations will bring the Chinese people human rights gains as well as economic benefits.

This year, such reasoning will be hard to sustain without gagging on the idea of Gulag work gangs.

□ 1520

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to stand up for what is right. The time has come to call the bluff of these Chinese leaders. The time has come to say that our Nation's preeminent role in upholding human rights around the world does not stop at the Chinese border.

Mr. Speaker, vote yes on this joint resolution. Take away MFN status now, and the old men in the Great Hall of the people will get the word. If we begin seeing reforms in China we can reinstate this MFN tomorrow.

We can reinstate it 3 months from now. If the Chinese leaders are sincere, we will see some reforms there; but if they are not, we will see the same thing that has taken place since all of us stood on this floor 1 year ago and some on both sides of the aisle said, "Let's give them another year."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, we gave them another year, and things got worse. People are dying, human rights are being denied to human beings, and that is wrong.

That is why I say pass the Solomon resolution today, and we will see in 3 months whether they are sincere or not. If they do make some reforms, I will be the first to introduce the resolution and to push Members on all sides of the aisle to reinstate MFN for China.

Let us see if it works.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution pending, ending most-favored-nation treatment for China.

This is not a debate about how best to move China in the direction of human rights.

This is a debate about whether or not that is relevant.

The position of the Bush administration is very clear: Human rights, schuman rights; the Bush administration regards our introduction of human rights into this debate as an eccentricity.

The President thinks that foreign policy is about big issues, the balance of power, stability in the world. Free speech for dissidents does not really come on to his radar screen. Nor, when he is talking about these kinds of issues, do side issues like jobs in America or our domestic economy. No one thinks the Chinese have any intention to buy very much from the United States. They have a mercantilist society. Talking about free trade with

China is like talking about trade in pork products with Israel. It is not something in which they have a great deal of interest.

The Chinese have, as my friend from New York has pointed out, a large surplus with the United States, and it is growing. They will very soon have, if they do not already have, the largest ratio in their favor because they believe in selling to us goods that are, by and large, not made in anything remotely resembling a market economy, and not buying anything from us in return.

And to George Bush, for whom domestic policy is really an interference in his workday, for George Bush the key is for us to make the leaders of China happy. It is to curry favor with the people who run the People's Republic of China so they will vote more with us in the United Nations, so they will agree with us on the solution in Kampuchea, so they will defer more to America's role in the world.

The President is not interested in pursuing human rights. And the notion that we will get more from the Chinese by engaging with them obviously is not something that people believe. If that was the case, we would be trading with Cuba. If that was the case, he would not have supported some of the sanctions he supported in the past in Central America.

The President thinks it is in the interest of the United States as a world power to deal with China, and the insistence on most-favored-nation status with China looks more like the insistence on continuing the trade with Iraq, more than anything else.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

#### RELATING TO MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

DISAPPROVING THE EXTENSION OF MFN TREATMENT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 263, while well meaning, represents an extreme and counterproductive response by the United States against the immoral practices committed by the Communist government of China against its own people.

Yes, we all want to take action against Chinese soldiers beating, torturing, and crushing peacefully protesting students with tanks in Tiananmen Square. But we must ask ourselves, "How do we do it to gain the most?"

In my opinion, denying MFN would lose far more than we could hope to gain for the Chinese people, about whom we are all deeply concerned.

Congress must seriously consider the consequences of withdrawing normal tariff treatment for China and this ending, for all practical purposes, any significant United States trade with that country.

It would seriously erode American influence there and would play into the hands of the hard liners in the Chinese Government at the expense of citizens and leaders seeking economic and political reform.

Under current law, MFN for China is conditioned only on emigration policies. The annual renewal procedures were designed to promote free emigration and to remove MFN only if China, or any other nonmarket country abandoned free emigration policies or made no effort to improve and reform their practices.

Although China's record is not perfect in this regard, they have continued to apply a relatively free emigration policy.

The principal restraint on emigration is not Chinese policy, but the capacity and willingness of other nations to absorb Chinese immigrants.

In addition, China continues to pursue a relatively open foreign travel policy; 255,000 people were issued passports for private travel in 1990, more than a threefold increase since 1986.

Emigration policies should not become the mask to punish China for other human rights violations. Such deplorable human rights abuses must be addressed directly, preferably with a unified U.S. policy that Congress and the President have formulated together.

Can returning China to isolationism, undermining United States business and investment in that country, tossing aside jobs generated by \$5 billion in United States exports, and abandoning reformist elements in China be justified by the United States in trying to achieve its human rights and foreign policy goals?

I think not.

The United States shoulders a great responsibility not only for ourselves but also for the interests of the Chinese people and of China's neighbors, such as Hong Kong, Korea, and Taiwan, who could be seriously harmed by United States actions which could destabilize the region.

The stakes are high and Congress should pursue a wise, objective, and effective course.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on House Joint Resolution 263.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has 26 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say I rise in support of the Solomon amendment. My general position on trade, I guess, is clear in this Chamber: It is for free trade, that we should not have many trade barriers. I am one who is reluctant in general to use trade as a lever, as a policy, as a 2 by 4.

But, Mr. Speaker, enough is enough already. China has violated every norm in every place we look. The human rights issue is well told. There has not been any liberation, there has not been any change, and there are times, as we all would agree, that the trade weapon, the trade lever should be used to help human rights.

We stand today, just as everyone agrees that the sanctions have had a real effect on South Africa, sanctions can have an effect on human rights in China.

But it goes beyond that. Mr. Speaker, in the economic area China has not been a good neighbor. China has been a country that has taken advantage every step of the way.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, they have imposed tariff and nontariff administrative controls to restrict foreign firms' access to its domestic markets. No protection of copyrights or trademarks. That one gets under my skin.

Mr. Speaker, I say, "If you want to be part of the international community, if you want to have huge balance-of-trade surpluses with our country and others, then at the very least join the community of nations and protect copyrights and trademarks. The allocation of foreign exchange is a means to control imports and the export of products made by prison labor to the United States and elsewhere. You add it up, and everywhere you look on the economic area, China doesn't deserve MFN status."

Then, Mr. Speaker, their weapons sales. Who do the scoundrels of the world look to to buy the most evil of weapons, the missiles that can deliver the chemical and even, possibly, atomic warheads? They look to China.

It is rare that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and myself are on the same side. On this we are. We have to say to the Chinese people and to the Government of China, "Enough is enough. No MFN until you reform up and down the line."

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me respond to the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], because Mr. SCHUMER is right on target. If you look back to 1980, when most-favored-nation treatment was first given to the People's



Republic of China, we set up bilateral trade arrangements pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 204. As approved by Congress, that resolution committed the United States and China to develop bilateral trade, provided that the United States and China would not discriminate against each other in their imports and exports; and, second we committed each nation to protect the patents, the trademarks, the copyrights, and industrial rights of the other nation.

How much in violation can they be of their bilateral obligations; never mind most favored nation?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHULZE], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 263.

According to section 402 of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, the true factor in determining whether a Communist country should receive MFN treatment is whether it maintains an emigration policy that is free and open, or is becoming free and open.

China's emigration policy, never free and open, has only become more restrictive since the Tiananmen Square massacre.

Since Tiananmen, the Chinese Government has required exit permit and passport applicants to file two new reports describing their performance during Tiananmen Square.

Regrettably, these reports, which are expected to be confessional in nature, are being used to restrict free emigration.

Also instituted after Tiananmen is the so-called cultivation fee that must be paid to the Chinese Government by students wishing to go abroad for self-financed graduate studies.

Given that this fee amounts to what the average Chinese college graduate earns over an 8-year period of time, this clearly precludes free movement and open emigration.

Existence of the cultivation fee also undermines a primary objective of the 1974 Trade Act: To deny MFN treatment to countries which impose more than a nominal fee, tax or fine on those citizens wishing to emigrate.

During 1984 debate on the Romania MFN issue, many of us opposed renewing that country's MFN status because it had instituted a similar fee. This fee, known as the education tax, had to be paid to the Government by those wishing to leave Romania, and amounted to what the average Romanian citizen earned over 3 to 5 years. Back then, our colleague PHIL CRANE justifiably referred to this onerous tax as a form of ransom. China's cultivation fee is no different.

Consider an excerpt from a May 1991 Library of Congress report on China's emigration policy. I quote:

Since the Tiananmen Square Massacre, the central authorities have made it more difficult for people to leave the country.

These additional controls very much seem to be aimed at discouraging people who disagree with the policies of the hardliners from leaving the country, either for shorter stays abroad or for emigration.

Even the State Department concedes that—and I quote

Existing restrictions on foreign travel were tightened in 1989.

Regrettably, though it admits that China's policy has worsened since Tiananmen, the State Department contends that China's emigration policy is open because it fills the annual U.S. permanent immigrant visa quota of 17,000 people.

While State has its own interpretation of the law, the 1974 Trade Act does not specify or imply that the degree of openness of a country's emigration policy should be based solely on whether it fills the U.S. quota.

According to the portion of the 1974 Ways and Means Committee report devoted to section 402, Congress sought—and I quote—"to assure the continued dedication of the United States to fundamental human rights." Congress is just as concerned about the fate of those seeking to leave Communist nations on a temporary basis, as it is for those struggling to become permanent immigrants elsewhere.

The fact remains that the People's Republic of China does not meet the 1974 Trade Act's freedom of emigration requirements, and that its MFN status should be revoked immediately.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on House Joint Resolution 263.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, colleagues of the House. We are all trying to accomplish the goal of improved human rights, greater openness in the society of China and perhaps even one day a democratic government there. The question of course is: How do we go about that?

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to remind ourselves what was the condition in China before 1972, when we began trade, travel, cultural exchanges, and other initiatives with that country under President Nixon. There is no question but that the human rights situation in China at that time was far, far worse than it is today even with the tragedy of Tiananmen Square. Since we began trading with China, since we opened diplomatic relations, and since we have had cultural exchanges and other visits with China, the situation has changed dramatically for the better. Now, it seems to me that what we are seeing today is an attempt to turn back the clock.

Earlier today one of my colleagues said on the floor of this House that this was just a Boeing initiative. Mr. Speaker, I represent a lot of people who

work for Boeing. Those planes, my colleagues, do not assemble themselves. Working men and women build those planes and their jobs should count for something. Yes, we sell Boeing airplanes to China, and let me tell my colleagues what would happen if this initiative goes through. The Europeans will sell airplanes to China. We will have literally shot ourselves in the foot in the hopes that it will make us feel good. That does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, what we need to do is adopt some, realistic conditions on MFN with China, but not turn our backs on President Nixon's initiatives at opening this country. With trade relations we can sit down with our Chinese friends and say to them, "We want better human rights in your country," as many of us who have traveled there have had the opportunities to do. If we turn back this clock, we completely squelch the opportunity to have that kind of exchange, and it makes no sense whatsoever.

□ 1540

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to compliment the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] on her efforts in the area of human rights. The reason I am up here, however, has to do with another area, and that is the area of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the proliferation of weapons, period.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] was in the chair during the hearings on MFN, and I pointed out that one of the lessons we got out of the war against Iraq and one of the reasons why we went to war against Saddam Hussein was because the man had potentially weapons of mass destruction. Now we are sending our people over there and threatening a second war if we cannot get our hands on the enriched uranium that he can use to create a nuclear device, and I do not think anyone has any doubt that he would use that if he had the opportunity. We went to war because we did not want aggression and we did not want a number of things, but one of the key elements was that we wanted to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Members what the Chinese have done. By the way, the administration put pressure on the Chinese not to become a giant proliferator of weapons of mass destruction. Last year they made the argument, "Trust us. Most-favored-nation status supports the reform process. Give us a year to work out our differences with the Chinese Government without denying MFN."

That is what they said last year. What have we gotten? Well, let me tell the Members this. China has sold Alge-

ria a nuclear reactor that is too large for research and too small for commercial power generation, but ideal for nuclear weapons production. Algeria has not signed the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

In the 1980's China has given Pakistan the complete design of a tested nuclear weapon, plus enough weapons-grade uranium to fuel two nuclear weapons. China has also sold nuclear technology to India.

Can we imagine the fact that the Chinese Government has armed both the Pakistanis and the Indians with nuclear material and given them the ability to have a nuclear weapon. The Indians and Pakistanis have marched against one another a number of times in recent years, and do not be surprised if one morning we wake up, if this trend continues, to find a report on the network news that the Indians and the Pakistanis have exchanged nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Members that the Chinese have also sold nuclear technology to South Africa, Argentina, and Brazil. This is a terrible thing.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to stand up for a new world order, a world in which we are not going to see the proliferation of sophisticated weapons and weapons of mass destruction, we have got to stand up right now against the Chinese and deny them the opportunity for MFN.

I am going to vote for Solomon, and I may have to end up voiting for Rostenkowski because it puts a number of reservations in there. But the bottom line is that we had better learn a lesson from what happened over there, and we had better stand up against countries that want to take us down the path toward greater sophisticated weaponry and the possibility of nuclear war.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee very much for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, for many years our country was engaged in the game of playing the China card. The China card was a diplomatic strategy whereby cozying up to the nation of China would help us in isolating the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany. That China card, as part of this great geopolitical strategy, was very important to us.

But with the fall of the Berlin Wall and with democracy breaking out all over Eastern Europe, as we turn over the China card in 1991, it is a deuce; it does not get us anything.

Although for many years we turned a blind eye to the nuclear export policy of China, to its human rights abuses, and to its prison labor policies, all of those things which may have made some sense in a larger geopolitical sense over a 20-year period, in 1991 it is

ancestor worship. We are taking a policy which over 20 years may have made some sense, but no longer, because over the next couple of years, in fact, we may be using the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and East Germany to isolate the Chinese. It will be just the flip of what it has been since the early 1970's.

So let us at least reform our policies to reflect the reality of the world in which we live. Here is a criminal nation, a nation which over the last several years has sold nuclear-related materials to both Pakistan and India, to both Brazil and Argentina, to both Iran and Iraq, and to Algeria. It goes on. The list is endless. It is a criminal nation, and if we want to look at the world through Kissingerian eyes, perhaps we had to turn a blind eye to some of these practices, but no longer, not in 1991.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation which is being proposed today is critically important for us to change the direction of our foreign policies to reflect the world as it exists today. We owe the people of China and the world no less.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me at the same time yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleagues for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in the strongest possible support for the resolution of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to terminate most-favored-nation treatment for China. My distinguished colleagues have given all their reasons for my support: An abominable human rights record, a persecution of the entire population of Tibet, an irresponsible export of weapons of mass destruction, and the use of prison labor indiscriminately. But I would like to approach the issue from a somewhat different vantage point.

This is not a vote on isolation. What the administration is doing, it is expressing its preference for the central Communist regime in every place on this planet where there are new and democratic forces trying to grope for a pluralistic and freer society. In China this administration is on the side of the central Communist government, the octogenarians who are too old to learn that there are new winds sweeping across this globe, winds of democracy and pluralism, the views that the young men and women of Tiananmen Square expressed.

This policy is made of the same cloth that is opposing Slovenia and Croatia in Yugoslavia. This administration is

siding with the central Communist government in Serbia against the forces which are striving for pluralism and freedom and democracy in Croatia and Slovenia, in the Republic of Kosovo and elsewhere. This administration is expressing its preference for the Central Government in the Soviet Union, not for the democratically elected governments of the Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and now Russia.

We just greeted in this House the first democratically elected leader of Russia in 1,000 years of Russian history, but in China we are rejecting the forces of pluralism and freedom and democracy, and we are about to kowtow to the regime that used tanks to destroy those Chinese young people just 2 years ago.

□ 1550

On July 4, 215 years ago, King George wrote in his diary, "Nothing extraordinary happened today." Little did he realize what an extraordinary thing happened on the 4th of July, 1776.

Extraordinary things are happening in China. People are putting their lives on the line. Remarkable things are happening in Tibet, where peace loving monks and nuns are striking out for freedom, and the Chinese Communist regime is torturing them, persecuting them, and killing them.

Remarkable things are happening in what we used to call Yugoslavia. Men and women are striking out for freedom. Two dozen young Slovenes were mowed down by the Central Government's tanks. And that is the side that this administration is supporting when it is supporting most-favored-nation treatment to China.

We have got to tell the whole world, the people who just brought down the Berlin Wall, yesterday, we have got to tell the people in Tibet that we stand with the wave of the future, that the wave of the future is not the Chinese Communist regime in Beijing. Those people will be thrown on the dust bin of history, when we will honor and cherish the young men and women whose lives were destroyed with the tanks of the Chinese Communist regime. We must take away most-favored-nation treatment from China, and we must do it now.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTOS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I just want to underscore the centrality of the point the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] is making. He is a deep student of foreign affairs, a devoted human rights advocate, and his point about this worldwide passion for order over liberty that is becoming central in this administration is a terribly important point. I want to thank the gentleman for making the



point, and hope that people will pay serious attention to its implications.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my friend for his comment. Let me just say, I deeply appreciate stability, but not stability at any cost. Stability at the price of human lives, of freedom, of dignity, of pluralism, is stability at too high a price, and we should not buy it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, it pains me greatly to have to disagree with my very good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. But I do rise in reluctant, but strong, opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if I thought for a moment that by adopting the Solomon resolution taking away MFN status from China we could facilitate the release of political prisoners, or an accounting of those who have been incarcerated, or contribute to greater freedom of religion and of the press, or bring to an end the export of goods produced by prison labor, or induce a more responsible Chinese foreign policy with respect to the transfer of nuclear technology and intermediate range ballistic missiles, I would strongly support this resolution. But the fact of the matter is that the adoption of this resolution will in no way whatsoever advance all of those eminently worthwhile objectives.

Mr. Speaker, thinking that we can bring the Chinese leadership to its knees by taking away MFN status from China is a complete and total illusion. For over two decades we had a comprehensive economic embargo against China, and we did not bring about any improvement in the human rights situation in that country by virtue of the economic isolation we imposed upon it.

For reasons of face alone, it is inconceivable that the Chinese leaders, once we take away MFN status, will come crawling on their knees to America saying, "Mea culpa. We have been wrong. We will make all of the changes you would like us to make."

The truth of the matter is, not only won't the adoption of this resolution not produce any progress on human rights, it is likely to have all sorts of counterproductive consequences. It will hurt American consumers who benefit from the importation of lower priced Chinese goods. We will deal a crippling blow to the economy of Hong Kong, which benefits greatly from the transshipment of Chinese goods to the United States, which benefits from MFN.

Mr. Speaker, by taking away MFN we will undermine the economic viability of the coastal provinces in China, which are the engines of economic re-

form in that country. There is considerable anecdotal evidence that many of the intellectuals who are in the forefront of the subterranean struggle for political and economic reform in China do not want MFN status taken away from them, because they fear that if MFN is taken away, there will be an overall and further crackdown in China, which will make the human rights situation even worse than it is today.

So I would suggest that if we are really concerned about human rights in China, the way to go is not to take away MFN completely, but to establish reasonable and responsible conditions on MFN, which we will have an opportunity to do a little bit later this afternoon.

I urge the House to reject the Solomon resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the resolution (H.J. Res. 263) disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation trade status for the People's Republic of China [PRC]. After the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] it may sound parochial, but I am opposing MFN for China because I do not care to trade away 50,000 textile and apparel jobs in my district so that the Communist Chinese Government can receive the perks associated with preferential trade status. With U.S. textile and apparel jobs already hit hard by unfair trade practices of foreign nations, I cannot stand idly by and see more jobs exported—many of them in my congressional district.

China is the single largest supplier of textiles and apparel to the United States, accounting for almost 14 percent of all United States textile and apparel imports. Yet, China continues to violate United States law by mislabeling textile products and shipping them through third countries. In 1990 alone, it is estimated that more than 2 billion dollars' worth of textiles and apparel entered the United States fraudulently. Furthermore, China has been exposed for use of prison labor to assemble apparel with the specific purpose of exporting to the United States. The textile industry faces enough of a challenge competing against a Chinese hourly wage rate of 37 cents compared to the United States hourly wage of almost \$10.

I have been told that denying MFN to China would jeopardize some \$5 billion the United States exports to China and hurt those industries that have substantial direct investment in China. This may be true in the short term, but in the long run, the Communist Chinese Government will realize that the United States is not going to ignore its unlawful and immoral behavior. China must reform if it wants MFN status. At

that time, the United States will reap the benefits of a stable, more democratic China, willing to play fair in today's competitive marketplace.

We all have to vote our conscience, and my conscience says "no" to MFN for China.

Let us aid Mexico instead.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are looking at something that is interesting. We have the historical basis on which to support the Solomon resolution. Many times we take this floor and we are dealing in the dark. It is a matter of conjecture. Oh, it may happen; it may not happen. We do not know for sure. We ought to do it this way; we ought to do it that way.

But history is here for us to read. The reality is, it is a myth. Those Members who stand in this well or at the tables and tell us that by voting against this we will ensure that the coming year will be better than the previous year as far as China and its human rights record and its treatment of its citizens, are in fact flying in the face of history.

Mr. Speaker, we gave them last year MFN after giving them all of our concerns in public debate. What did they do? Not only did they not make better their human rights record, but they went further. They sold technology in the form of missiles, technology that we had provided, to other countries around the world. They clamped down and executed prisoners that had been in prison previously. Once they got what they wanted, they were content to stick it up our nose, if one wants to be graphic about it.

We sent an envoy. The President of the United States sent an envoy to China to try to talk and deal with them.

□ 1600

He was sent home with a scold like he was a little child by the old men in Peking who do not think we ought to meddle in their internal affairs but we ought to give them the benefit of MFN so that they can then send more imports to the United States than we send to them and, therefore, build up a trade surplus of almost \$11 billion, estimated to be \$16 billion next year, per capita by virtue of imports, the largest trade surplus in the world.

Let us not lose jobs to the Chinese and at the same time subsidize the lack of human rights in that country, the intolerable treatment of their citizens. History now beseeches Members to

vote for the Solomon resolution to deny them MFN. It is the only thing an American should do.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

What is the motivation of the President of the United States for wishing to extend this trade status to the Chinese for another year? What is his motivation? Does he want to become an honorary King of Siam? Does he want to be enriched personally, or is it because he believes strongly, does our President, that it is in the best interests of our country, of the future of our society that we maintain the relationship with the emerging China that he seeks with this continuation of the trade status?

Even the critics of the President over here say it is not that he is not interested in human rights. He is not interested in this or that. He is only interested in doing what is best for the country. Of course. And that is why we must accord him, as the chief executive of our country, the privilege of supporting him in this foreign policy matter. It is easier and better for our country to follow the leadership of the elected President of the United States in the enunciation, the execution of foreign policy than to adhere to 535 Members of Congress who have 535 different ways of executing foreign policy.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has no further speakers other than his summation, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the past 11 years, we have denied the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status. And what has happened over that 11-year period? After we spent billions and billions of dollars building up our own military at the expense of the American taxpayers, the end result is that democracy has broken out all over Eastern and Central Europe. And we can be very proud of that because of the sacrifices the American people made.

During that same 11-year period, we have given most-favored-nation status to the People's Republic of China. And what has happened? Violations of human rights have become worse and worse and worse. And in the last 2 years, they have just become absolutely intolerable.

I would just ask the Members to consider one thing: If China's MFN is taken away today, that does not mean China can never get it back. If China's MFN is revoked, there is nothing to stop the President from coming back to Congress in a few months if condi-

tions so warrant and asking us to restore it. And I wish that would happen.

If the Government of China shapes up, we could give MFN back to them, and China would respect the United States for it.

The problem we face today is simply the fact that China does not take us seriously. China does not believe our commitment to human rights and democracy. They do not believe it because we continue to wink at their abuses.

The time for excusing China's behavior, Mr. Speaker, is over. Let us pass this resolution today and show the regime in China that we mean what we say. I am going to vote for the Solomon resolution. I am also going to vote for the Pelosi resolution and the accompanying amendments that were passed overwhelmingly in the Committee on Ways and Means.

This entire body should do that and send these two bills to the Senate, and do my colleagues know what? China would wake up in a hurry. What happens to all the trade with China? Chinese goods are coming via Hong Kong, where they change the label and say, "Made in Hong Kong" and then send them to this country. They send them over to Macao, and they change the label and say "Made in Macao" and send them here. More and more of my people are unemployed. I say to hell with the \$15 billion deficit in trade with China. Let us send a message they will not forget.

I urge support of the Solomon resolution.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, when I got up this morning to wash my face I said, "This is going to be a miserable day." And it is for me a miserable day because I knew I was going to face some of my finest friends and their best oratory orating about what we should do about China. It is not a simple proposition. If things are bad in China today, and they are bad, they were horrible when we started on this negotiation of trade with them about 15 years ago. They had just completed or almost completed the Cultural Revolution in which hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of Chinese lost their lives.

China is a poor, pitiful country, and horribly led. But history teaches that if we are going to do anything about China, and we should do something about China, because they are all human beings like we are and one out of every five people on Earth is Chinese. They are poor. They are ill-housed, ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-led. But it is our human responsibility to do something about it.

And what should we do? Should we isolate China again as we did for 35

years, 35 disastrous years, or should we continue to work with the Chinese?

Now, I would bow to no person in this House about my support of human rights. I think my record proves it. I probably have listened to more people talk about China than anybody in this House, and I have probably lectured the Chinese more than anybody in this House.

It occurs to me that the wise and most sensible thing to do is to reject the Solomon proposal, which in effect could lead to the isolation of China again, and then to proceed to the debate on the Pelosi proposal which puts some stringent conditions upon most-favored-nation treatment for China. For if we withdraw from China, there is no one else on Earth who is going there like we do and demanding conditions for their trade and talking and working with the Chinese people to try to improve the human conditions within China.

The last time China opened itself up to Western influence, it was pillaged by the Europeans, and they fought the Japanese for 25 years to keep them from overrunning and subjugating their country. The Chinese trust the Americans. They look to America, and it is no mere accident that the great demonstrations at Tiananmen Square that ended so tragically, that it was the American symbol of freedom that had to be torn down by the Chinese Army.

If we continue to construct this policy that we have had toward China for the last 15 years, then I think there is hope for those one-fifth of all the people on Earth, poor people, pitiful people, ill-clothed, ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-led. But there is hope if we will continue our contact with them to continue to work for them and to set a good example for them and to try to educate them so that they can have a more prosperous economy, a greater opportunity for personal freedom and liberty, and that should be the role of America.

□ 1610

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solomon amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the resolution. The Chinese Government repeatedly has violated every standard of international conduct. They have demonstrated they are a government apart from their people, over their people, and against their people. As Americans, we cannot stand idly by while the values and ideals we cherish are crushed by communism's tanks.

The Chinese Communists believe that the world outside, especially Americans, do not care what they do to their citizens. They believe we forget easily and care only about shallow values and self-interest. Because they do not understand us, they do not realize that



we will not forget the young man standing in front of a line of tanks pleading for his people. We will not forget the toppling of the Goddess of Democracy, built in the image of our beloved Statue of Liberty. These are memories for a lifetime.

Revoking MFN status is the proper response for the Congress to take. The Chinese Government is exploiting their trade relationship with the United States.

In the first year after Tiananmen, the Chinese trade surplus with the United States grew by almost 50 percent. According to the USTR's 1991 report on foreign trade barriers, "tariff rates range from 120 to 170 percent" on consumer goods. Compared to this, even standard tariff rates in the United States are generous. We should also notice that tariffs and barriers are highest on consumer goods, products which might provide a better life for the Chinese people. The Chinese Communists are acquiring our hard currency, denying their people the benefits of their work, and proping-up their corrupt system on the back of American trade.

In our opposition to the Communist Government however, we should take care not to harm the innocent people of that country. President Bush raises some valid points about potential harm to those we are seeking to help. In the next year, I believe that Congress should study ways to limit the damage done to the people of China by changes in our trade relationship. We should look at making adjustments to help the budding private enterprise, the Western-looking regions of the country. This would be the approach the Communist leaders in Beijing would fear the most—turning our back to them, extending our hand to their people.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if the Chinese are going to take the hard line with their citizens, we have to take the hard line with China. The Solomon amendment is the only route.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is a major cosponsor of that resolution, and I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Pursuant to House Resolution 189, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 204, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—223

Abercrombie	Hatcher	Payne (NJ)
Ackerman	Hayes (IL)	Pelosi
Andrews (ME)	Hayes (LA)	Perkins
Andrews (NJ)	Hefley	Porter
Annunzio	Hefner	Poshard
Anthony	Henger	Price
Applegate	Hertel	Quillen
Atkins	Hochbrueckner	Rahall
Ballenger	Horn	Rangel
Barnard	Hoyer	Ravenel
Barton	Hubbard	Ray
Bennett	Hughes	Richardson
Berman	Hunter	Ridge
Bevill	Hutto	Riggs
Bilbray	James	Ritter
Bonior	Jefferson	Rogers
Borski	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Boxer	Jones (GA)	Rose-Lehtinen
Browder	Jones (NC)	Rose
Bruce	Kanjorski	Roybal
Bryant	Kasich	Russo
Bunning	Kennedy	Sabo
Burton	Kildee	Sanders
Bustamante	Kleczka	Sawyer
Campbell (CO)	Kolter	Scheuer
Cardin	Kostmayer	Schroeder
Carper	Kyl	Schulze
Clay	LaFalce	Schumer
Coble	Lantos	Sensenbrenner
Coleman (TX)	Lehman (CA)	Shuster
Collins (IL)	Levin (MI)	Sikorski
Collins (MI)	Lewine (CA)	Sisisky
Condit	Lewis (FL)	Slaughter (NY)
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Smith (FL)
Costello	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Cox (CA)	Lloyd	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Lowey (NY)	Snowe
Dannemeyer	Manton	Solomon
DeFazio	Markay	Spratt
Dellums	Martinez	Staggers
Derrick	Mavroules	Stark
Dickinson	McCandless	Stearns
Dixon	McCurdy	Stokes
Donnelly	McEwen	Studds
Doolittle	McGrath	Synar
Dornan (CA)	McHugh	Tallon
Downey	McMillan (NC)	Tauzin
Duncan	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
Durbin	Mfume	Thomas (GA)
Dwyer	Miller (CA)	Thornton
Early	Mineta	Torricelli
Eckart	Mink	Town
Edwards (CA)	Moakley	Trafficant
Edwards (OK)	Mollinari	Traxler
Edwards (TX)	Mollohan	Unsoeld
Engel	Moorhead	Valentine
Erdreich	Moran	Vento
Espy	Morella	Visclosky
Evans	Mrazek	Walker
Fish	Natcher	Washington
Flake	Neal (MA)	Waters
Foglietta	Neal (NC)	Waxman
Ford (MI)	Nowak	Weiss
Ford (TN)	Oakar	Weldon
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Whitten
Frost	Obey	Wilson
Gaydos	Olin	Wise
Gejdenson	Oliver	Wolf
Gephardt	Owens (NY)	Wolpe
Gilman	Owens (UT)	Wylie
Gonzalez	Pallone	Yates
Gordon	Panetta	Yatron
Hall (OH)	Parker	
Hancock	Patterson	
Harris	Paxon	

NAYS—204

Alexander	Bateman	Broomfield
Allard	Bellenson	Brown
Anderson	Bentley	Byron
Andrews (TX)	Bereuter	Callahan
Archer	Bilirakis	Camp
Armey	Bliley	Campbell (CA)
Aspin	Boehlert	Carr
AuCoin	Boehner	Chandler
Bacchus	Boucher	Chapman
Baker	Brewster	Clement
Barrett	Brooks	Clinger

Coleman (MO)	Johnson (CT)	Pickett
Combest	Johnson (SD)	Pickle
Cooper	Johnson (TX)	Pursell
Coughlin	Johnston	Ramstad
Cox (IL)	Jontz	Reed
Coyne	Kaptur	Regula
Crane	Kennelly	Rhodes
Cunningham	Klug	Rinaldo
Darden	Kolbe	Roberts
Davis	Kopetski	Roe
de la Garza	Lagomarsino	Roemer
DeLauro	Lancaster	Rostenkowski
Dicks	LaRocco	Roth
Dingell	Laughlin	Roukema
Dooley	Leach	Rowland
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (FL)	Sangmeister
Dreier	Lent	Santorum
Dymally	Lewis (CA)	Sarpalius
Emerson	Lightfoot	Savage
English	Livingston	Saxton
Ewing	Long	Schaefer
Fascell	Lowery (CA)	Schiff
Fawell	Luken	Sharp
Fazio	Machtley	Shaw
Feighan	Marlenee	Shays
Fields	Martin	Skaggs
Franks (CT)	Matsui	Skeen
Gallely	Mazzoli	Skelton
Gallo	McCloskey	Slattery
Gekas	McCollum	Slaughter (VA)
Geren	McCrery	Smith (IA)
Gibbons	McDade	Smith (OR)
Gilchrist	McDermott	Solarz
Gillmor	McMillen (MD)	Spence
Gingrich	Meyers	Stallings
Glickman	Michel	Stenholm
Goodling	Miller (OH)	Stump
Goss	Miller (WA)	Sundquist
Gradison	Montgomery	Sweet
Grandy	Moody	Swift
Green	Morrison	Tanner
Guarini	Murphy	Taylor (NC)
Gunderson	Murtha	Thomas (CA)
Hall (TX)	Myers	Thomas (WY)
Hamilton	Nagle	Torres
Hammerschmidt	Nichols	Upton
Hansen	Nussle	Vander Jagt
Hastert	Ortiz	Volkmer
Henry	Orton	Vucanovich
Hoagland	Oxley	Walsh
Hobson	Packard	Weber
Holloway	Payne (VA)	Williams
Horton	Pease	Wyden
Houghton	Penny	Young (AK)
Huckaby	Peterson (FL)	Young (FL)
Hyde	Peterson (MN)	Zeliff
Ireland	Petri	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—6

DeLay	Hopkins	Jacobs
Gray	Inhofe	Serrano

□ 1633

Messrs. HAMMERSCHMIDT, DOOLEY, GUNDERSON, ROTH, CARR, NAGLE, SMITH of Oregon, HALL of Texas, and GEREN of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WISE of West Virginia, WILSON, MCCURDY, HAYES of Illinois, and MRAZEK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### REGARDING EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO PRODUCTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 189, it is now in order to consider the bill, H.R. 2212.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 189, I call up the bill, H.R. 2212, regarding the

extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2212

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**TITLE I—PRECONDITIONS FOR THE RECEIPT BY CHINA OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT**

**SEC. 101. ADDITIONAL OBJECTIVES WHICH THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA MUST MEET IN ORDER TO RECEIVE NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may not recommend the continuation of a waiver in 1992 for a 12-month period under subsection (d) of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974 for the People's Republic of China unless the President reports in the document required to be submitted by such subsection, that the government of that country—

(1) has, in regard to the events that led up to, and occurred during and after, the violent repression of dissent in Tiananmen Square on June 3, 1989—

(A) accounted for those citizens who were detained, accused, or sentenced as a result of the nonviolent expression of their political beliefs during those events; and

(B) released citizens who were imprisoned after such detention, accusation, or sentencing;

(2) has made significant progress in—

(A) taking appropriate action to prevent gross violations of internationally recognized human rights in the People's Republic of China and Tibet;

(B) ending religious persecution in the People's Republic of China and Tibet, and releasing leaders and members of all religious groups detained, incarcerated, or under house arrest as a result of the expression of their religious beliefs;

(C) removing restrictions in the People's Republic of China and Tibet, on freedom of the press and on broadcasts by the Voice of America;

(D) terminating the acts of intimidation and harassment of Chinese citizens in the United States, including the return and renewal of passports confiscated by authorities as retribution for prodemocracy activities;

(E) ensuring access of international human rights monitoring groups to prisoners, trials, and places of detention;

(F) ensuring freedom from torture and from inhumane prison conditions; and

(G) terminating prohibitions on peaceful assembly and demonstration imposed after June 3, 1989.

(3) is adhering to the Joint Declaration on Hong Kong that was entered into between the United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) The term "acts of intimidation and harassment" in paragraph (2)(D) means actions taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China that are intended to deter or interfere with, or to be in retaliation for, the nonviolent expression of political beliefs by Chinese citizens within the United States.

(2) The terms "detained" and "imprisoned" include, but are not limited to, incarceration in prisons, jails, labor reform camps, labor reeducation camps, and local police detention centers.

(3) The term "gross violations of internationally recognized human rights" in

paragraph (2)(A) includes, but is not limited to, torture, cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, prolonged detention without charges and trial, causing the disappearance of persons by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons, secret judicial proceedings, and other flagrant denial of the right to life, liberty, or the security of any person.

(4) The term "significant process" in paragraph (2) means the implementation and faithful execution of measures that will lead to the termination of the repressive practices identified in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of that paragraph.

**SEC. 102. REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT.**

If the President recommends in 1992 that the waiver authority referred to in section 101 be extended to the People's Republic of China, the President shall include in the document required to be submitted to the Congress by section 402(d) of the Trade Act of 1974 a report on the extent to which the Government of the People's Republic of China has, during the period covered by the report, implemented the measures listed in section 101(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 189, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

**COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 3, strike out lines 1 through 4.

Page 3, line 5, strike out "SEC. 101." and insert "SECTION 1."

Page 3, strike lines 13 through 15 and insert the following: President—

(1) reports in the document required to be submitted by such subsection, that the government of that country—

Page 3, line 20, redesignate paragraph (1) as subparagraph (A).

Page 3, line 24, redesignate subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 3, line 24, in clause (i), as redesignated, strike out "accounted for those" and insert "provided an accounting of".

Page 4, line 4, redesignate subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 4, line 7, redesignate paragraph (2) as subparagraph (B).

Page 4, line 7, in subparagraph (B), as redesignated, insert "overall" before "significant progress".

Page 4, line 9, redesignate subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 4, line 2, clause (i), as redesignated, strike out "China and" and insert "China, including".

Page 4, line 14, redesignate subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 4, lines 15 and 16, in clause (ii), as redesignated, strike out "and Tibet" and insert "including Tibet".

Page 4, line 21, redesignate subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 4, line 22, in clause (iii), as redesignated, strike out "and Tibet" and insert "including Tibet".

Page 5, line 1, redesignate subparagraph (D) as clause (iv).

Page 5, line 6, redesignate subparagraph (E) as clause (v).

Page 5, line 2, in clause (v), as redesignated, insert "or humanitarian" after "monitoring".

Page 5, line 11, redesignate subparagraph (F) as clause (vi).

Page 5, line 14, redesignate subparagraph (G) as clause (vii).

Page 5, line 16, in clause (vii), as redesignated, strike "and" and insert a comma.

Page 5, line 17, redesignate subparagraph (3) as subparagraph (C).

Page 5, line 20, in subparagraph (C), as redesignated, strike the period and insert a comma.

Page 5, after line 20, insert the following:

(D) does not support or administer any program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

(E) has provided clear and unequivocal assurances to the United States that it is not assisting and will not assist any nonnuclear weapons state, either directly or indirectly, in acquiring nuclear explosive, devices or the materials and components for such devices.

(F) has provided clear and unequivocal assurances that it will not contribute to the proliferation of missiles and is a Missile Technology Control Regime adherent with respect, at least, to countries, in the Middle East and South Asia.

(G) has taken appropriate steps to prevent the exportation of products made by prisoners and detainees assigned to labor camps, prisons, detention centers and other facilities holding detainees and has allowed United States officials and international humanitarian and intergovernmental organizations to inspect the places of detention suspected of producing export goods to ensure that appropriate steps have been taken and are in effect, and

(H) has moderated its position regarding the access of the Republic of China (Taiwan) to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; and

(2) based on the assurances referred to in paragraph (1)(E) and all other information available to the United States Government, has made the certifications and submitted the report required by the Joint Resolution relating to the approval and implementation of the proposed agreement for nuclear cooperation between the United States and the People's Republic of China (Public Law 99-183, 99 Stat. 1174).

Page 7, line 10, strike out "(2)(D)" and insert "(1)(B)(iv)".

Page 7, line 21, strike out "(2)(A)" and insert "(1)(B)(i)".

Page 8, line 5, strike out "process" and insert "progress".

Page 8, line 6, strike out "(2)" and insert "(1)(B)".

Page 8, line 6 and 7, strike out "and faithful execution".

Page 8, line 7, insert "meaningfully reduce or" before "lead to".

Page 8, lines 9 and 10, strike "subparagraphs (A) through (G) of".

Page 8, insert after line 10, the following:

(5) The terms "missile" and "Missile Technology Control Regime adherent" in paragraph (1)(F) have the respective meanings given them in section 74 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2797c) and the phrase "countries in the Middle East and South Asia" in such paragraph means Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Sudan, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Yemen, India, and Pakistan.

Page 8, line 21, strike out "102." and insert "2."

Page 8, line 23, strike out "authority".

Page 8, line 23, strike out "101 be extended" and insert "1 be continued with respect".



Page 9, line 4, strike out "implementated" and insert "implemented".

Page 9, line 5, strike out "101" and insert "1".

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

□ 1640

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2212 establishes a number of new conditions—in addition to those contained in current law—which China must meet in order for the President to recommend a continuation of China's most-favored-nation [MFN] status in 1992. I urge adoption of the bill.

But first, I want to commend our colleague, NANCY PELOSI for her tireless efforts in keeping the issue of China's human rights behavior so squarely before the eyes of Congress and the American people. Any improvements in this area will be in large part because of her dedicated legislative efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the conditions contained in H.R. 2212 as reported from the Committee on Ways and Means relate to the overall human rights situation in China and various trade and foreign policy concerns. The bill requires that China account for citizens detained, accused, or sentenced as a result of the nonviolent expression of their political beliefs during the 1989 demonstrations in Tiananmen Square; and that China release such citizens. It requires that China end the proliferation of missiles and nuclear technology; end forced abortion and sterilization; take steps to end exports of goods made by prison labor; and take action in a number of other areas. Finally, the bill contains seven objectives relating to human rights, in which overall significant progress must be made before the President may recommend extension of China's MFN status in 1992.

I would have preferred to see the conditions of H.R. 2212 limited to human rights concerns. After all, the genesis of the bill was the unprovoked and bloody crackdown on nonviolent demonstrators in Tiananmen Square in 1989—the worst possible kind of human rights violation.

Despite my reservations about H.R. 2212 and the committee amendments that have been offered en bloc, I will not stand in the way of their adoption by the House. I am prepared to support the bill, as amended by the committee, with the hope that we can improve the bill in conference with the other body. Our collective objective should be to produce a bill that the President can

sign, rather than a bill we know he will veto. Passing a bill that provokes such a veto—a veto that will probably be sustained—will only give us a hollow victory, and will frustrate our common goal of significant change in Chinese policy and behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2212. It is a bill which is elaborate in its scope and good intentions. In effect, however, it's a bill which would result in an end to normal tariff treatment, MFN, for China after 1 year and the removal of the United States as a major influence for economic and political change in that country.

Congress should not be lured into a web of theoretical leverage and false punishments. It should instead maintain a clear focus on the likely consequences of this legislation.

If we care about influencing improved Human Rights, a country of the stature of the United States cannot afford to walk away from its relationship with a country of such indisputable importance, however strained that relationship has become and despite the harsh leadership that is currently in power.

The question should be, "What is the most effective policy to promote and achieve our human rights and foreign policy objectives?" H.R. 2212 is emphatically not the answer.

If anything, it could cause a dangerous reaction by the Chinese Government that will further harm the Chinese people and destabilize the entire region. Hong Kong is particularly vulnerable.

H.R. 2212 establishes strict new inflexible conditions for renewal of MFN for China in 1992. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has already explained the bill's provisions.

However, I want to emphasize that the result of this legislation will be to end MFN and, consequently, all meaningful trade with that country.

Would we successfully influence Chinese actions by this tactic? Can we successfully impose the United States Constitution, our human rights standards, and our way of life on a country with its own traditions and culture? Because China now falters under a repressive regime, should the Chinese people, the citizens of Hong Kong, our own businesses and investments in the region, and United States exporters pay the price for our actions today?

China has not responded, and likely will not respond, while the Congress and the President are locked in battle over United States-China policy.

A more productive approach would be for the Congress and the President to work together to develop targeted

sanctions and incentives designed to achieve results rather than to undermine U.S. influence.

The President has already announced a long list of sanctions ranging from an end to trade and development programs to restrictions on textile imports to rejection of licenses for satellite projects and other high technology exports.

H.R. 2212, though a tempting ultimatum, is the wrong approach at the wrong time. The hard-liners would be happy with this bill, but the Chinese people will suffer further repression and isolation. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2212.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I come to the well today to present to the House of Representatives H.R. 2212, a bill which renews most-favored-nation for China this year, but its renewal for next year is conditioned on improvements in human rights in China.

Mr. Speaker, I bring with me to the well a familiar picture to many of us here. This House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, has been a bastion of democracy. You, the Members of the House of Representatives, voted to support and protect the Chinese students in America. You also voted last year overwhelmingly to condition renewal of most-favored-nation status to China.

□ 1650

Mr. Speaker, we see before us this familiar picture of a man before the tanks and can recall our impressions of seeing the live shots of this brave, courageous, young man there in Tiananmen Square. We have an opportunity today in this Chamber to stand with that man in support of democracy. That day the shot heard around the world 200 years ago was heard in Tiananmen Square. Hopefully today it will reverberate in the Capitol and over into the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to thank the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] for his patience, assistance, and his support in this legislation; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] whom I can always count on for his good advice; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] for his advice and counsel as well. Special thanks to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] for using his good offices to work on the Committee on Ways and Means to bring a consensus around this legislation.

I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] that this bill is optimistic. It is an optimistic bill. It is a bill that says we renew most-favored-na-

tion status with China with conditions because we believe these conditions are reasonable, and they are conditions that the Chinese Government should and can easily meet.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has briefly touched on what the bill does. I will only say that it calls for the release of those prisoners who were arrested in events leading up to and surrounding Tiananmen Square, prisoners of conscience who demonstrated nonviolently for democracy in China.

First, at the outset may I say, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues can vote for both bills. They can vote "yes" on Solomon, as many of them have already done, and they can vote "yes" on Pelosi. Solomon addresses renewal of most-favored-nation for 1991. My bill addresses it for 1992.

I would also like to thank over 150 Members of the House who cosponsored this legislation, enabling me to bring it to the floor with such great support and especially those colleagues from trade areas like mine where it is not all up-side to vote for conditioning most-favored-nation renewal. We have walked this ground before, as I said, in promoting and supporting those who promote democracy in China.

Now I would like to just talk about the bill for a moment, if I may. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the debate today has generated so much conversation among our colleagues, and I would like to address three issues.

First, Mr. Speaker, is the human rights issue, and to those who say that things have gotten better since 1990, I say they have not gotten better since 1989. The trend which was going in a positive direction has now turned the corner and is coming down. The human rights report that was given by Amnesty International yesterday documents the imprisonments, the beatings, the torture, the repression that continues in China and that has worsened since 1989. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], our colleague who has a special interest in religious freedom in China, has talked about Bishop Fan of Shanghai who was arrested a few weeks ago in China in response to the Pope naming a Chinese cardinal.

On trade, the Chinese Government has erected barriers to our products. We know that. I would just like to comment on that a little more specifically—\$6 million in 1989, \$10 billion in 1990, a projected \$15 billion in 1991. That, Mr. Speaker, is the increase in the trade surplus the Chinese Government has with us.

No less an authority than the CIA issued a report on protectionism and trade with China, and in it they say that there is little appetite for economic reform in China.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to quote from Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, who was quoted in the same article

when at a hearing on China's trade policy at the Joint Economic Committee. He said that, "It looks like the United States is one of the biggest chumps in the Western world." We look hopeless.

Mr. Speaker, we are not hopeless. We have opportunity, and we have opportunity today.

I pointed out the trade deficit in relationship to human rights, because that is what equals leverage for us. I do not believe that China will give up.

We have a unique opportunity to use our leverage to release those people who risked their lives for democratic reform. Given China's \$10, \$12, \$15 billion trade advantage with the United States, the Chinese Government has a strong incentive to make changes that would qualify it for 1992.

Because I do not have much time, I would just like to share with Members of the body this watch. Some have said that Tiananmen Square is something we should put behind us, and I wish we can, and maybe we can today by passing this bill. This was a watch given to the soldiers who crushed the rebellion. Each soldier was given a watch engraved with the words: "For suppressing the turmoil, June 1989." I think that this watch, instead of an award or reward for crushing the demonstrations, should be a reminder to the Chinese authorities that their time is running out, that they are yesterday and the young people who demonstrated for democracy are tomorrow. And it is ironic that this watch that they gave as a reward to their soldiers who crushed the unarmed students would be used here today to help us keep the time on this debate to condition most-favored-nation status on China's renewal on improving human rights there.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues and urge them to support H.R. 2212.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Trade.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2212. I share my colleagues' abhorrence of Beijing's blatant disregard for human rights, its refusal to fully open its market to American goods, and its defiance of multilateral efforts to ban totally the sale of weapons technology to all third world countries. However, I believe that the steps we are attempting to take today will do little, if anything, to encourage the People's Republic of China to improve its behavior. It is foolhardy to believe that the Chinese will accept a list of conditions spelling out how their Government should conduct its internal affairs in order to engage in normal trade, since no other country imposes such conditions. MFN would therefore be withdrawn. Perhaps not this year, but certainly next year.

Make no mistake about it, H.R. 2212 translates into a 1-year plant closing notice for many companies operating in China.

In my mind, there is no better way to show Beijing that we disapprove of its actions than by rewarding Taiwan for its advances in freedom and democracy. As every good parent knows, rewarding change is the most effective means of improving behavior. The administration has it within its power to drive this message home to Beijing by supporting Taiwan's application to the GATT.

Short of taking this action, I support the measure which will be offered later today in the form of a motion to recommit with instructions, which gives the President the flexibility to determine whether progress in a number of areas has been made in China. This approach makes sense because it allows us to maintain a relationship with China and offers Beijing a blueprint for change. More contact with China—not less—is the best way to bring about greater freedom and respect for human dignity.

Nobody understands the need for continued United States presence in China better than the people of Hong Kong. Sir David Wilson, Governor of Hong Kong, sums it up best:

We must do everything possible to ensure that, in 1997, Hong Kong's capitalist system, and the rights and freedoms enjoyed by its people, are still flourishing and have the strength to survive the inevitable shock of the change of sovereignty. United States withdrawal of China's MFN status could bring about an economic recession that would jeopardize all our efforts.

The people of Hong Kong have as great an interest as anyone in an enlightened and outward-looking China. We believe that continued trade, contact, and communication with China will encourage openness, and that the withdrawal of MFN status would bring about a more isolationist mentality. This would be in the interest of neither Hong Kong nor the United States.

We also must not forget the effect removal of MFN would have here at home. Because China is a major supplier of low-cost shoes, apparel, toys, and electronics, raising tariffs and prices on these inexpensive products would disproportionately hurt lower income consumers. In addition, it has been estimated by the toy manufacturers of America that loss of MFN would result in approximately 25,000 United States jobs, and at least 300,000 jobs in China being placed in jeopardy in the toy industry alone.

Last month, on my way to the White House to meet with the President on the very issue which is before us today, I drove past the Commerce Department building. From my car, I noticed the inscription above the west entrance, which reads: "Commerce Defies Every Wind Outrides Every Tempest and Invades Every Zone."

I believe there is a great deal of wisdom in this poetic phrase, and I hope



that my colleagues will consider its message as we deliberate today over whether to allow commerce and all that it encompasses to prevail.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 2212 and to support the motion to recommit with instructions.

□ 1700

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, we begin this debate by declaring with the President, we have no desire to isolate China.

But we ask him to see what is obvious: Embracing China without conditions or reservations has failed to modify her behavior. And her behavior must be changed.

We granted MFN status to China as the stirrings of the democracy movement started just 2 years ago, when the rulers and the ruled looked to America for a sign.

Within weeks after MFN status was granted, the tanks rolled over students, thousands were imprisoned, reforms were reversed, freedom was denied, and tyranny prevailed.

When we granted MFN we provided moral encouragement to the Government and to the people who held the guns, and we left the students, the protestors, and the captives in their thrall.

Then the President did in private what he promised not to do in public. While in the open he scorned China's hardened regime, in secret his emissaries drank their champagne.

While in public he renewed China's privileged trading status, in private he watched them terrorize their people, prepare missile sales to Syria and Pakistan, spread nuclear weapons technology to Algeria, and rack up a \$10 billion trade surplus in this country.

Unbalanced and unfair trade with the United States builds China economically, increases its reserves of foreign capital, and makes China more self-sufficient and less prone to our appeals for human rights and restraint.

And American workers are the ones who get hurt by unconditioned trade: By some estimates, we've lost 400,000 American jobs.

Tragically and ironically, the President's policy is isolating China and insulating her regime from our influence.

This policy does not work. When we help China, they scorn us.

We should no longer reward this failure with more help for China—especially when that help comes without conditions and at the cost of American jobs and American values.

We should be using trade with strings to pull them toward reform.

Today, we say to China: You've got one year of open trade with America to clean up your act.

One year to respect the rights of your people.

One year to remove restrictions on your press.

One year to stop shopping goods produced by prison labor in American markets.

One year to end the trafficking and profiteering in nuclear weapons.

One year to stop this disgusting and coercive policy placing limits on family size.

One year, China; 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, no other nation has greater moral authority or economic capacity to enforce these demands on China.

Throughout our 214-year history, our Nation has actively and aggressively roiled the waters, so that a wave of freedom spreading from our shores would touch every continent in the world.

When it comes to furthering freedom and liberty, America makes waves, and always will.

Franklin Roosevelt, probably our greatest President, and one of our finest orators, said it best: "We defend and we build a way of life, not for America alone but for all mankind."

Through a determined process of engagement and leadership for democracy, we have said to the downtrodden, the oppressed, the enslaved, and the tyrannized, your cause is our fight too. And not by military means alone.

Granting and withdrawing the privilege of trading in America's marketplace is an effective means for prying open the locked jaws of liberty or to confront the behavior of tyrants.

I deeply disagree with the administration's decision to dismantle sanctions against South Africa before South Africa has finally dismantled apartheid.

But even the administration must acknowledge that the sanctions then-President Reagan and then-Vice-President Bush opposed 5 years ago brought us closer today to a truly democratic system of majority rule in that country.

Sanctions succeed.

Even now, the Bush administration relies on economic sanctions against Iraq. We have used trade sanctions to win majority rule in Zimbabwe, to free Soviet Jews, and to speed the overdue departure of dictators in Africa, and Central and South America.

And there is now perhaps unique agreement in the Congress that this special American commitment and strength should be used, in a measured and effective way, to bring about needed change and reform in China—change that would immeasurably improve the lives of the Chinese people, change that would ultimately enhance the security of the world.

So let us make waves that will touch the tides of the South China Sea.

In this great era of renaissance for the rights of man, we know from the

words of Walesa and Havel and Mandela and countless others that these actions are not just idealistic, they work.

And now they must be permitted to work in China.

We congratulate the gentlewoman from California for her courage, we thank the distinguished Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for his leadership, and we urge our colleagues to support this important legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation for the human rights of people in China and across the world.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHULZE], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I would like to take a few minutes to talk about most-favored-nation status, what it means when we say the words "most-favored-nation." That seems to give the connotation that we are going to give these people the finest deal in the world.

Actually, it is somewhat of a misnomer. There are two columns in the tariff schedule, column one and column two. It is very simple. We have laid out certain rules and regulations and laws to determine whether one's products come in under column one or column two.

Column two treatment is for Communists or nonmarket economy countries. Why? Why do we have a higher rate or a greater charge for nonmarket economy or Communist countries? Let us think about that for a minute.

Suppose you are a businessman and you are selling widgets that you manufacture in the United States of America, and you pay your employees Social Security and you pay the local school taxes and you pay your county taxes and your water taxes and your State taxes and your Federal taxes and you are part of the community. You pay to have the roads done. If you need a railroad siding, you pay to run the railroad siding. If you need more electricity, you pay the local utility to get more electricity. If you add more equipment that uses more electricity or gas, you pay to get that. So all of these costs are involved in the product, this widget, that is being produced.

You are in direct competition with this same product being produced in a nonmarket economy country. Is it fair? Is it a level playing field? Let us look.

Does the manufacturer in a nonmarket economy country pay for the electricity? No, not usually. Does he pay his employees? The money may come through him but the amount of pay is dictated by the state. Does he pay for the railroad that takes the product to market? No. Does he pay for the overhead? No.

If he wants to expand his production, how does he do it? He does not do it. A

central planner somewhere in the capital city makes a decision that he is going to expand his production, and they tell him to do it.

The point being, we are not comparing apples and oranges. This widget made in a nonmarket economy country, it is virtually impossible to determine an honest, fair cost on it. So how is the cost determined? How is the price of this product determined on the world market?

Well, those same central planners sit up there and they say, how much hard currency do we need?

□ 1710

Where are we going to sell this product? How much are we going to get for it? What do we have to sell it for, to penetrate certain markets?

That is how the price is determined. The price is not determined by the cost of his employees and the cost of the electricity, his school taxes, and other things that he has.

So why do we have two columns? Does it make sense? Of course it makes sense. It was, you might say, in a way to either protect or insulate the domestic producer from totally unfair competition, from someone who did not care about market economy.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell Members, Adam Smith never envisioned a world in which nations would develop product lines to secure hard currency. So we need two columns, column 1 and column 2.

In this instance we have a law in the United States of America, and that law says you get most-favored-nation status even if you are a nonmarket economy country, if you are leaning toward freer immigration. That is our little way of saying we want the world to be a wonderful, rosy place, where everybody can try to be as free and open as we are. We know it is not going to happen, but it is our little wedge, to say we are asking this one little thing. Just make your immigration freer, let your people travel and see what the rest of the world is like, have a taste of freedom, if you are not afraid to open that door just a little crack.

That is why we have MFN. That is why we have column 1 and column 2. That is what this debate is all about.

Mr. Speaker, if we follow the rules and regulations and laws, we will send this message. We will vote for Pelosi, and send a very strong message, that we will no longer stand for that type of abuse around the world.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] showed us a picture today that is forever etched in our memory. It is of a young man stop-

ping a column of tanks in Tiananmen Square. When it happened, and even now, I wonder as I look at that young man, what kind of inner courage must it have taken to walk in front of that line of tanks, and I wonder what kind of nerve we will have today as policymakers in trying to deal with China.

Mr. Speaker, I represent farmers who sell a great deal of grain to China. That trade is important to us. I do not want to do anything today that jeopardizes that trade. We have had experience with the Soviet grain embargo a decade ago that suggests that that approach shoots ourselves in the foot.

But the question today is not about a grain embargo or a trade embargo. The question is should we extend most-favored-nation status to China.

I think we should extend MFN to China, but I believe, as the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] does, that we ought to extend MFN with conditions.

The barbarian behavior of the Chinese cannot be ignored, and it cannot be excused. We cannot pretend that Tiananmen Square did not happen. It did. The issues of human rights, prison labor, nuclear proliferation, and more are not insignificant. They are issues that we have the responsibility to raise.

China now has a \$10 billion surplus with us. To my constituents who want continued trade with China, I would say instead of wringing our hands, worrying, and being nervous that if we impose conditions on MFN, China will buy less from us, we should expect, yes, demand, that China buy more from us to reduce that trade deficit.

We should also expect and demand that China begin to behave like responsible citizens of the world, respectful of the rights of other human beings. So let's extend MFN to China, but let's do it with the conditions in the Pelosi bill. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Pelosi amendment and in support of a condition-free MFN status, because I believe we may ultimately convince the Beijing government to alter its oppressive human rights policies, but I do not believe we will ever coerce them. Mr. Speaker, I would relate a personal anecdote here. I was one of the first American television actors to actually work in the People's Republic of China back in 1983. I can recall one day in Shanghai, we finished our shooting early, got back on the bus, and went to the Chinese location manager. We said, "Okay, we are ready to go to the next location. Let's go."

He paused and said, "Yes, but the next location is not ready for you."

Mr. Speaker, what I think he was giving us an important clue to that Chinese frame of mind that we are attempting to change today by conditioning MFN status. Because what that Chinese location manager was saying to our film company in 1983 is the same thing President Yang Shangkun is saying to us, today when he says, "If you get tough with China, China will not be pushed." He says, "The more pressure you apply, the less China will give in."

So when we beat our breasts and decry Chinese arms sales to the Middle East, he points out, correctly, that the United States deals in arms to the same region, in many cases to the same country.

When we sanctimoniously proclaim MFN should not be extended to nations that destroy their own people, he points out, correctly, that our Nation currently extends MFN status to Syria, one of the cardinal suppressors of human rights on the planet, and our recent ally in the gulf war.

Rightly or wrongly, Mr. Speaker, when we preach to the Chinese, we find ourselves guilty of the same things we accuse them of; namely, operating in their own self-interest.

Then we argue that sanctions do have a positive effect, as in the case of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, South Africa is a country of 65 million people, and even then we needed a coalition of nations united against apartheid. China is a nation of well over 1 billion people, and we stand alone.

If we really seek to isolate them, let us at least admit to ourselves that the first people to suffer if we withdraw MFN status will not be the Chinese people, it will be the American people.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has talked about the effects of another grain embargo on American wheat farmers. But he is not just speaking for wheat farmers, he is speaking for all cash grain and oil seed farmers who are seeing prices reduced systematically every year, who know that their only recourse to profit is export, and if grain sits in bins, it will not be sold. The price will be depressed, and farmers all over this country will lose money. We either sell it, or we smell it.

Mr. Speaker, there are others who are caught in this crossfire of our good intentions. I have a letter from the Tyco Toy Co., based in New Jersey. They say:

Tyco relies heavily upon imports of toys manufactured in the People's Republic of China because it enables us to be competitive in the United States market, providing toys children want at prices their parents can afford.

In addition, at least 1,400 United States jobs in our company, as well as countless additional jobs in other firms with whom we do business, are dependent upon Chinese production.

Were the United States to discontinue extending MFN duty treatment to Chinese



products, we would be severely affected. Duty rates would skyrocket from an average of 6 percent to 70 percent, effectively destroying our ability to provide low-cost quality products to consumers and very likely requiring us to cut back on related U.S. employment.

Mr. Speaker, finally, if we truly wish to subvert communism, then let us continue to use the one weapon the leaders of Beijing truly fear. They call it evolutionism. It is their term for our supposed U.S. policy of attempting to undermine totalitarianism with trade and investment.

Mr. Speaker, evolutionism is alive and well in southern China. Streets there are devoid of the socialist slogans we see in Beijing. Factories there presently operate outside of China's centrally planned economy.

Unfortunately, the Pelosi amendment, although well intentioned, is, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] said, a plant closing notice for the forces of evolutionism, which are the only influence we will ever have to get China to move to the next location.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say in speaking about southern China, the dominant influence there is Hong Kong right now. If we strip away MFN, the chance that Hong Kong may ultimately reform China will be lost, and the assurance that China will reform Hong Kong will be guaranteed.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2212, which has been offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California, NANCY PELOSI. She has done a remarkable job pursuing this legislation, and she should be commended for her perseverance.

My support for placing conditions on most-favored-nation to China stems not from any desire to isolate that important country or see our bilateral relations ruined. Indeed, I am sympathetic to some of the President's arguments that greater economic contacts between the United States and China is one way to encourage political reforms. For the last 2 years since the Chinese Government ordered the massacre at Tiananmen Square, we pursued just such a policy. I think it is fair to say that President Bush has gone the extra mile in attempting to persuade the Chinese Government, through high level contacts and economic ties, to change its foreign and domestic policies.

But there comes a point, Mr. Speaker, when we must make a candid assessment of our relations with China and take appropriate steps to enact a policy which is consistent with our values and our interests. The fact is that the Chinese Government has treated the United States and President Bush's policy of accommodation with utter contempt. Despite the President's best efforts, China remains one of the world's most oppressive societies. The aging dictators in the Communist Party continue to deny the Chinese people even the

most basic human rights. People are routinely persecuted for their political and religious beliefs. The destruction of what is left of Tibet's culture continues unabated. Hundreds of those arrested in the aftermath of Tiananmen Square have been tortured, sent to kangaroo courts and political re-education camps, or simply disappeared. At a time when democratic change is taking hold in much of the world, China remains a glaring exception.

But if its internal policies are not enough to warrant placing conditions on China's MFN status, surely its foreign policies do. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have seen China unleash an arms proliferation policy in the Third World that is dangerous, irresponsible, and presents a direct threat to our interests and allies. China has sold nuclear weapons technology to Iran, Iraq, North Korea, Algeria, India, and Pakistan. It has sold nuclear-capable ballistic missiles to Syria, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. And in the effort to gain U.N. approval to take military action against Saddam Hussein in the Persian Gulf war, the best President Bush could get from the Chinese Government was an abstention in the Security Council.

Furthermore, China has taken advantage of its current MFN status by enacting unfair trade and labor policies, including more than \$400 million in annual thefts of United States intellectual property rights and protected trademarks, that have caused our trade deficit to reach \$10 billion. China also continues to bar Taiwan, which has the 13th largest economy in the world and is our 6th largest trading partner, from gaining entry into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Given these factors, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Pelosi bill, which gives the Government of China 1 year to address these concerns, is a reasonable approach to this complicated issue. I understand that some industries in America will be negatively impacted if China fails to meet the conditions in this bill and is denied MFN status next year. But American businesses and workers are already being hurt by China's unfair trade practices.

Moreover, we are not placing unreasonable demands on China. By insisting that the Government of China improve its human rights record, stop selling dangerous, sophisticated military technology to radical Third World regimes, and change its unfair trade practices, we are merely asking China to act like a responsible world power and abide by civilized rules of behavior. The President's policy of the last 2 years, unfortunately, has failed to accomplish this minimum objective. The Pelosi bill will give strength and purpose to our policy toward China, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2212 which conditions the renewal of MFN for China on improvements in basic human rights. I want to commend my colleagues in their bipartisan effort to bring this resolution to the House floor; particularly I want to note the strong leadership and relentless commitment shown by Congresswoman

PELOSI on this issue of critical importance to the United States and to the people of China.

In May 1989, when Soviet President Gorbachev made his historic visit to Beijing, hundreds of thousands of students staged a sit-in at Tiananmen Square, demanding that the Chinese Government recognize and respond to their pro-democracy movement and calling for a direct dialog between the demonstrators and the leaders. Thousands of them went on a hunger strike to underscore their appeal. In Beijing, Shanghai, and other cities, hundreds of thousands of citizens staged demonstrations and marches in support of the students' actions. On May 17, an estimated 2 million people took to the streets in Beijing in a show of solidarity for the students on strike. Those people included the rank and file of China: office workers, drivers, journalists, factory workers and civil servants.

On May 30, students and teachers created a 3-meter tall white statue of the Goddess of Liberty and erected it at the center of Tiananmen Square, facing Mao's portrait.

This short-lived counter-revolution ended tragically and brutally. In the early morning hours of June 4, the People's Liberation Army broke the uneasy stand-off in the square, opening fire on all those who dared stand up for freedom. Thousands of unarmed people were killed and untold numbers were injured. After the massacre a massive witch-hunt ensued; hundreds were summarily detained and later dozens were executed.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember these facts because this is not ancient history. The people responsible for the Tiananmen Square massacre are still the leaders of China today. We need to be clear as to the type of signal we are sending and to whom. I have no doubt that President Bush is genuinely committed to achieving democratic reform in China. But the administration's policy will not lead to that result.

Two years after the brutal massacre and 1 year after this administration successfully recommended a 12-month extension of the Jackson-Vanik amendment waiver authority—China has no freedom of the press, no freedom of assembly, no freedom of speech, no freedom of conscience, no right to emigrate, no representative government, and no self-determination. What there is in China—according to the Department of State's own report—are thousands of political prisoners, repression spanning the breadth of the country at every level, fear, forced labor, and torture.

In short, within the walls of China there is no realistic alternative to political and spiritual bondage. It is a society that remains tense, ruled by a government that has been successful in

quashing virtually all open expression of dissent. Systematically depriving its citizens of any possibility to exercise the most fundamental human rights and robbing them of the social and economic rights it claims to champion, China is a nation engaged in a dangerous waiting game, each citizen seeking to outlive a regime almost universally viewed as illegitimate.

Respect for human rights and fundamental liberties cannot be brought about solely by external pressure from the West in general or the United States in particular, crucial though this is. Ultimately, fulfillment of China's human rights obligations will only occur when its leaders recognizes the inevitable futility of trying to rule by force. The more vicious and cruel the leadership becomes, the more profound will be the people's reaction to it.

The administration is right that withholding MFN trading status may not be enough to pressure the Chinese regime to change its behavior in specific and critical areas. But while withholding MFN alone may not be enough, it is a start. Moral rhetoric alone may not force powerful regimes to respect the basic human rights of their citizens, but backing up our words with deeds may.

Over the past few years we have witnessed signs the world over indicating an increasing acceptance of a more open and constructive discussion of human rights problems and more promising action toward the realization of stated human rights goals. A collective consensus recognizing the dignity of the individual has emerged as a political issue with immense moral force in every region. Broad, widely-shared concepts of human rights, fundamental freedoms and social justice have surfaced. These compelling political issues have moved from the periphery to the center stage of world politics—certainly nowhere more so than at Tiananmen Square.

But if we are to prevent respect for human rights from being no more than the transitory hallmark of one short-lived era in international relations, if we are to ensure that they are an enduring principle upon which nations act, then we must here today apply those principles in our relations with the Chinese leadership. There should be no mistaking our message: The United States will not help underwrite the totalitarian regime in China or anywhere else.

Eleven years ago as a Presidential candidate, President Bush criticized the Carter administration for sacrificing strategic interests for human rights. At that time, candidate Bush stated:

We should not impose our standard of human rights on every country around the world. China is a good example. We must improve relations, but if we start dictating to them or cutting them off because of human

rights, we will diminish our strategic interests.

This is not only flawed reasoning but short-term thinking. First, the United States is not trying to dictate human rights standards to China. These are standards which the Chinese Government has itself endorsed in the universal declaration of human rights. And they are the standards to which the Chinese people—the people of Tiananmen Square—clearly want their government held.

Second, United States strategic interests are better served by a China controlled by prodemocracy forces rather than dictators. As we have learned in country after country in Europe, the United States develops its strongest alliances, engenders its greatest respect, and ensures its lasting security when we stand firmly and unequivocally for the principles upon which our own Nation was founded. To the degree that our actions must affect the Chinese nation, let it not be at the expense of individual freedoms and human dignity.

On behalf of those seeking individual rights and democracy in China and throughout the world—I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and insist that certain basic human rights be respected before renewal of MFN is granted again.

□ 1720

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 2212, a measure designed to establish conditions for extension of MFN to the People's Republic of China. As an original cosponsor of this measure, I appreciate that it now includes a number of provisions that I believe strengthen the bill and bring balance and consistency to an array of human rights issues which mar United States-Republic of China relations.

Included in the bill from the last Congress is the provisions requiring that significant progress be made in ending religious persecution in China and Tibet, and releasing leaders and members of religious groups who have been detained, incarcerated, or under house arrest because of their religious activities. Mr. Speaker, religious freedom, in my view, is the most rudimentary of human rights. Perhaps troubled by the uprooting of communism throughout Eastern Europe, and particularly in Romania, and the role played by the church in these countries, Beijing has now initiated a nationwide crackdown on religion that is unprecedented.

Ever since my return from the PRC in late March, which I would point out parenthetically, along with my good

friend, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. FRANK WOLF, and others, we met with Li Peng and a number of other high leaders, we have been receiving firsthand reports that the house church movement and a number of other religious leaders, including bishops, have been under increased repression and there have been more arrests, more detentions, and more incarcerations for a number of years.

Mr. Speaker, I am also very pleased that the bill reflects one of my deepest concerns, a concern with regard to the one-child-per-couple policy and the use of coercive abortion and coercive sterilization against the Chinese women and children. One of the most succinct analyses I have seen of the Chinese population control program is found in Dr. Aird's book in which he points out that "the Chinese program remains highly coercive, not because of local deviations from central policies but as a direct, inevitable and intentional consequence of those policies."

Dr. Aird points out that foreign organizations and individuals that laud the Chinese program or provide financial or technical assistance for any aspect of it place themselves in the position of supporting the program as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have an obligation to be consistent in decrying these human rights abuses at every juncture, whether it be in MFN or in such things as the Kemp-Kasten language.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the realities of the cold war caused compromises of some of our most basic principles. From Marcos in the Philippines to the Shah himself, the cold, hard realities of the cold war required some compromises.

But is is a new time. The cold war has ended. America is secure and the need to compromise our basic principles has ended.

America can now return to her most noble and highest of traditions as the defender of basic human rights. The Pelosi resolution embodies this reality. Only the fact that we are divided today can surprise anyone, for demonstrators are jailed, trade laws are trampled, arms are sold to those who threaten our forces. Nuclear technology is used against our interests. Indeed, one wonders in this administration what must someone do to be the least favored nation if someone could commit all of these acts and be the most favored?

Mr. Speaker, there are those who will bring freedom one day to China. But today they have no allies, no weapons, no tanks but us. Our voices are their only weapon, this institution their only potential ally. Someday they will prevail, because freedom always prevails, and on that day it will be remembered by 1 billion Chinese either the



United States stood with a few ailing leaders intent on stopping the forces of freedom or America stood with those who would be free, who wage this fight today.

Let it be remembered in this hour of need America stood firm, America stood with freedom and it will never be forgotten.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the resolution to disapprove most-favored-nation status for China, and I will also vote no on the Pelosi resolution, H.R. 2212, to extend MFN status but with unworkable and unrealistic conditions.

China has a deplorable record on human rights. There is no one in this House that condones the way the Chinese have treated prodemocracy supporters. And, in fact, Congress has gone on record to send this message to the Chinese Government.

This debate today, however, is about more than just sending signals about human rights or messages condemning the hardliners in the Chinese Government. The MFN debate is about taking action to foster the move to democracy in China and, so importantly, it is about our trade relationship with 1½ billion people and the impact that trade has on American business and industry.

Both our Government and the private sector, and our allies and trading partners, have invested more than just money. We've helped sow the seeds of democracy and free enterprise in China.

As any farmer will tell you, once you plant a crop, you have to nurture it and then prepare for the elements. If the weather is good you can expect a bountiful harvest.

In China, the seeds of democracy that were planted with the help of our Government have survived through some bad weather and now need our patience and support in order to be harvested.

American business and agriculture have invested heavily in the development of democracy in China. The contacts made by American business people in China, and business exchange programs, have helped the Chinese better understand our Government and the free market system.

It is this knowledge—it is the exposure to the "Sun" that shines on the free and open system—that can keep the seeds of democracy growing and developing.

Disapproving MFN for China, or extending it with such realistic conditions, denies that flow of information and experience to those we want to help and encourage.

Disapproving MFN also slaps American business, especially American agriculture in the face.

Except for Hong Kong and Macau, we have invested more than any country in China, more than \$4.11 billion since 1979. We had more than \$5 billion in exports to China last year, and we imported more than \$15 billion in 1990.

Regarding our wheat exports, which totaled \$511 million last year, the Congressional Research Service [CRS] recently completed a re-

port on the impact that the loss of MFN, and subsequent retaliation by the Chinese, could have on United States wheat prices.

Wheat prices are expected to drop by 27 cents, or 10 percent, from levels we could expect to earn if we continued MFN. The report continues to state "psychological effects of losing one of our biggest foreign wheat markets might push prices down even further in future time periods."

The most alarming aspect of this report, which I encourage my colleagues to review, pointed out that if one used 1990 wheat production data, rejecting MFN to China could result in a total Government and private wheat sector loss of more than \$740 million.

What are we going to tell our constituents who will lose their jobs because of the loss of Chinese exports and imports?

And may I remind this body that it was our strong export markets that softened the blow of the recent economic recession on our economy. Had we not had such a strong export capability, the layoffs and unemployment rates could have been much worse.

While I have no doubt of the sincerity of my colleagues who oppose unconditional renewal of MFN status, I cannot agree with their alternative, the Pelosi bill now before use.

I urge my colleagues to support the President's proposal for MFN renewal and, in doing so, I'm urging you to support both the forces of democracy in China and American business and agriculture.

Do not vote to again isolate China, leaving it only to the repressive regime that existed prior to the opening of their society to Western ideas. And do not vote to take away a valuable market for American trade.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I did not support House Joint Resolution 263, and I cannot support H.R. 2212 and would ask my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in opposition to the Pelosi resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of extending the most-favored-nation status to the People's Republic of China and in opposition to House Joint Resolution 263 and H.R. 2212 for three basic reasons.

First, my primary concern is for the American farmer. Denial or conditioning of MFN will result in the closing of the market for United States grain in China. Our agricultural exports to China were valued at over \$800 million in 1990 and China is the largest market for United States wheat.

Moreover, I am afraid that, through the denial or conditioning of MFN status, the United States will be entirely shut out of the China grain market. Competitors in Europe will quickly move in and fill the void in the Chinese market. Other agricultural products will be hurt by this as well. Corn, for example, is the preferred feed grain and will lose United States market share to cheap feed wheat if Chinese wheat markets are lost. This is the last thing the Iowa agricultural economy needs as it begins to recover from severe spring flooding.

Second, the Chinese people will be punished for the actions of their repressive Government. It is estimated that failure to extend MFN status to China will cost South China's export industries up to 2 million jobs. Through American investment and contact, Chinese workers have benefited from jobs and an enhanced well-being. Losing this contact will hurt the workers the most and not the Government heads in Beijing.

Finally, I, too, am appalled by China's poor record with respect to human rights, sales of weapons to our enemies, and religious persecution. But I do not believe that we should use denial of MFN status to solve political problems. Our country should pursue other avenues to punish the Government of China for its action rather than using the American farmers, workers, and industries as pawns in an international game of strategy.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1730

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2212.

Mr. Speaker, not one of us thinks that Tiananmen Square was anything but a horrible tragedy. Not one of us will stand here and defend China and its human rights record, because it is indefensible.

However, how do we accomplish the goal of improving this record, a goal we all share? Will it work to literally cut off trade with China? My belief is that it will not.

Let me point out something else. Is there anything wrong with standing up for American workers? There is a two-way trade with China in the State of Washington that in 1990 amounted to over \$3 billion. China bought planes, wheat, forest products, electronics, and cattle from Washington State. Those products, Mr. Speaker, were produced by Washington workers, men and women whose jobs depend upon trade, trade, yes, with the People's Republic of China.

We will have later today a motion to recommit and a substitute, essentially the Archer amendment, which we considered in the Committee on Ways and Means that embodies recognition of the goals we all share. It calls for the President, in extending MFN for China, to consider human rights, political prisoners, religious persecution, free press, access for human rights groups to prisons and trials in China, the kind of conditions which I think are not only realistic but will be useful in attempting to achieve our goals. But these sanctions will not impose penalties on the totally innocent American worker.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2212, the Pelosi bill which would establish

conditions for the renewal of China's most-favored-nation status for China in 1992.

I am frankly mystified by the President's continued reluctance to apply any significant pressure on the Chinese Government when there has been no meaningful improvement in that Government's behavior since the Tiananmen Square massacre.

The administration seems to believe that it can buy internal reforms in China through trade preferences and economic assistance.

This approach is reminiscent of the administration's efforts to buy improved relations with Saddam Hussein. We all know the tragic consequences of the administration's failure to impose sanctions on Iraq. Apparently the President and his advisors have learned nothing from past mistakes.

Today, the administration wishes us to turn our backs on China's abuse of human rights in Tibet, its brutal repression of its own people, and its crucial role in the proliferation of nuclear and missile technology and extend most-favored-nation status without question or condition.

Such a policy is shameful and doomed to fail.

China remains the world's most egregious outlaw state on nuclear and missile proliferation. China has in recent years supplied sensitive nuclear and/or missile technology to Pakistan, India, Argentina, Brazil, South Africa, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Algeria. Despite repeated assurances to the contrary, the Chinese still provide the one-stop shopping center for any nation that wants to get into the nuclear club.

The human rights situation has not improved one iota. Prodemocracy demonstrators are still in prison; untold scores have been executed. Torture is rampant. And many have simply disappeared.

The repression in Tibet continues unabated. A de facto state of martial law was in place as China celebrated the 40th anniversary of what China calls Tibet's liberation in May. I assure you, no Tibetans were celebrating that anniversary.

And now, new reports have surfaced that China is using forced prison labor to produce exports. Are these the Chinese labor practices we want to endorse by giving preferential trade treatment to Chinese products? Mr. Speaker, we are allowing China to reap a projected \$15 billion trade surplus with the United States this year largely at the expense of American textile workers, not to mention the abuse of jailed Chinese.

If we unconditionally extend MFN this year, we will be saying to the Beijing leadership that executing prodemocracy activists is OK, that giving Algeria the bomb is acceptable, that selling missiles to the Middle East is fine with us. I do not believe this is the message that we want to send to the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2212. It tells the Chinese Government in no uncertain terms what improvements must be made if it is to receive most-favored-nation status in 1992.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

I oppose granting most-favored-nation [MFN] status to China. MFN status should be a privilege and a reward for upholding values of freedom and democracy. These standards do not apply to the Communist-controlled regime in Beijing which does not observe basic freedoms of assembly, speech, or religion or provide for free and fair elections. I am particularly concerned with China's policies in the following areas:

First, China has demonstrated time and time again its flagrant disregard for nonproliferation regimes. In fact, China is significantly responsible for the proliferation of ballistic missiles in the Third World and to nations with interests inimical to ours. These ballistic missiles could 1 day carry weapons of mass destruction aimed at American troops, our allies, or even, potentially, the continental United States. The Chinese have sold the Algerians and the Pakistanis nuclear reactors; sold the Saudi Arabians billions of dollars worth of intermediate-range ballistic missiles; and have offered nuclear-capable missiles to Syria, Libya, Iran and Pakistan.

Despite recent indications to the contrary, there does not appear to be any unanimity in the Chinese Government that this practice will stop. In late March Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen announced that China was not a founding member of the 15-member Missile Technology Control Regime [MTCR] and "should not be called upon to assume corresponding responsibilities." Will we have to wait until the Chinese sell their CSS-4, which has a range of 16,300 km, to take seriously the threat posed by the proliferation of Chinese ballistic missiles?

Advocates of MFN for China will argue that diplomacy will stem the tide of proliferation. I disagree. It is what the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs called the China Syndrome.

A pattern of events and activities—driven by bureaucracies and fostered by distorted and unadjusted notions of economic and strategic interests—that has for decades frustrated the achievement of \* \* \* non-proliferation objectives.

Chinese proliferation policies are an affront to American efforts to enhance world stability and provide for the protection of her citizens and should not be rewarded with unconditional MFN status.

Second, the Chinese carry out a policy of forced sterilization and abortion

if a woman has already given birth to a child. This practice is an egregious violation of the human rights of the family. In 1988 I helped a Chinese couple from my district stay in the United States after the Chinese Government ordered them home to abort the child she was carrying. Their offense was that she did not have a birth coupon from the government which would have allowed her to exceed the "one-couple, one-child" policy.

Third, under the Jackson-Vanik statute, the decision on whether to extend MFN to Communist countries hinges largely on whether they permit free and open emigration, and on their human rights practices. The present constitution of the People's Republic of China does not accord Chinese citizens the right of free emigration. Since the Tiananmen Square massacre of June 4, 1989, the central authorities have made it more difficult for people to leave the country. Human rights abuses against the citizens of Tibet amount to nothing less than genocide.

Finally, the Chinese are illegally dumping products on the American market made by prisoners in concentration camps. And, they continue to support some of the most ruthless mass murders of this century—the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia. It is unacceptable for the United States to help the Chinese Government continue to coerce its own people and the people of other countries. For all of these reasons, I oppose MFN status for China.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution. I commend the gentlewoman from California for her perseverance and leadership in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2212 to condition next year's renewal of most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China on progress on human rights. I commend the author of the legislation, Ms. PELOSI, for her determination and dedication to this important issue and of the chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, and its Subcommittee on Trade, Mr. GIBBONS, for their leadership in bringing this measure before the House.

Mr. Speaker, like most of our colleagues, I shared the outrage and dismay of the American people—indeed, of freedom lovers everywhere—as we witnessed the brutal massacre of unarmed Chinese students and peaceful democracy activists in Tiananmen Square 2 years ago. I supported the imposition of tough sanctions against the Government of the PRC to express our displeasure with this deplorable and tragic event and with the ongoing human rights violations in China and Tibet. Through those actions, the Congress made clear to the Chinese Government that there is no excuse for their inexcusable treatment of the Chinese and Tibetan people.

At the same time, I realize that efforts to support democratic reform and respect for



human rights in China cannot take place in a vacuum. We must find a way to reconcile our abhorrence of Chinese human rights abuses with the need to strengthen whatever reform tendencies may exist inside the PRC. I believe the approach offered in H.R. 2212, which establishes progress in the human rights field, including an accounting and release of political prisoners, as a precondition for China's MFN renewal next year, is both reasonable and necessary.

Mr. Speaker, according to the independent and respected human rights organization Asia Watch, Chinese prisons and labor camps hold more political prisoners today than at any time since the bloody and repressive period of the Cultural Revolution. The estimates of those arrested in the aftermath of the June 1989 crackdown on the democracy movement range from several thousand to as high as 30,000. This is in addition to thousands more who have been imprisoned for the nonviolent expression of their political or religious views over the last 10 years. Among those long-term political prisoners being held in solitary confinement is Wei Jingsheng, the renowned Democracy Wall activist, who has been imprisoned for over 12 years, much of that time in solitary confinement.

Until the Government of the People's Republic of China demonstrates its willingness to abide by international standards of human rights and the rule of law, it should not expect to reap the benefits of membership in the community of civilized nations. I hope that the Chinese leadership will take seriously the action of the Congress today and will soon improve significantly its record of respect for internationally recognized human rights. By passage of this measure today, the Government of the PRC is put on notice that, without such steps, the relationship between the United States and China will be seriously, and perhaps irreparably, harmed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate adoption of this measure.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of those who are still arguing that we should renew most-favored-nation status for China without conditions. How brutal does the Chinese Government have to be before we decide that it is no longer acceptable to carry on business as usual with Beijing's aging and autocratic tyrants?

They have rolled tanks over the bodies of students who had the courage to risk their lives for freedom. They have left thousands of others to languish in Chinese prisons, facing torture and conditions any of us would consider inhumane. They have sold weapons and nuclear technology without regard for the devastation they may have wrought. They continue to brutalize the people of Tibet—and they even had the gall to celebrate the 40th anniversary of that country's occupation. Finally, they turn their backs on the very notion of civilized free trade by closing their market to most American-made imports. The real question

is: How can the President—or anyone else for that matter—justify this behavior by smiling benevolently at Beijing's tyrants?

Some argue that cutting off MFN will weaken any leverage we may have to press Beijing to improve its human rights record. Then it would follow that they would be enthusiastic supporters of H.R. 2212, the Pelosi, Pease, Solarz bill, which would grant MFN this year while conditioning renewal of MFN next year. That would give the ruling clique in Beijing plenty of time to take steps that all of us would agree are essential if the Government has any intention of returning to the path of civilized conduct.

We must decide whether we will stand with Fang Lizhi and the Chinese students and democracy activists who have spoken out in support of H.R. 2212, or whether we follow the President in conducting business as usual.

We must decide whether we will stand with those who represent China's future as a nation of free people, or with a group of frightened old despots who represent China's past. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2212.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the future and to support H.R. 2212.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of renewing China's most-favored-nation [MFN] status for another year.

MFN status simply allows goods from a country to receive the lowest U.S. tariffs available to the exports of any other nation—virtually every nation on the globe already has MFN status, however, current law requires that Communist nations can have such status only if the President annually requests that they be accorded MFN status and Congress does not disapprove the request.

No one defends China's human rights abuses, but to me, there are two fundamental questions at hand: First, will cutting off MFN status improve China's internal situation, or will it actually have a detrimental effect—strengthening its hard-liners, isolating China in the world community and causing China to move backward on human rights? Second, so long as our allies continue to grant MFN status to China, and stand ready and willing to take our existing agricultural markets in China, will cutting off MFN amount to a political and moral gesture that largely has the effect of punishing American farmers?

I believe that terminating the trade links to the United States will cause the aging Chinese leadership to become even more isolated and less inclined to meet United States and international human rights concerns. A reduction in trade reduces the interaction of people and ideas between the two nations—exposure to the ideas and the prosperity of the west that gave rise to the prodemocracy movement in

the first place. MFN status encourages the Chinese government to remain engaged in the family of nations.

There are, of course, and will continue to be, a number of sanctions against the Chinese that are imposed even while MFN status is in place. Secretary Baker has pointed out in his letter to Congress that the administration will continue to impose targeted sanctions against the Chinese, such as termination of military exchanges and the denial of certain export licenses. The export of U.S. supercomputers, communications satellites and high technology equipment that may have military applications will remain in place. These sanctions are correctly aimed at halting Chinese proliferation of missile and nuclear weapons technology, and future actions can be taken by the Administration if improvements in Chinese policy are not forthcoming.

The second matter is whether ending MFN for China will cause American farmers to be the only real losers. It is almost certain that the termination of United States MFN status for China will result in retaliation against American exporters. The \$5 billion in United States exports to China will almost certainly go to American competitors in Japan, West Germany and other western nations which have always provided MFN to China. The Australians and Canadians as well as Europeans are especially anxious to take American grain markets from the United States.

According to a recent Congressional Research Service study, the termination of Chinese grain purchases would cause already depressed wheat prices to plunge by another 27 cents per bushel, or about 10 percent. This is a double-barreled loser, since this price decline would cost the Federal Government \$500 million in higher grain deficiency payments while farmers would still lose \$125 million on next year's crop.

China went from the 60th largest customer of American farm products in 1986 to the 8th largest in 1989. Wheat accounted for 80 percent of the \$1.4 billion sales in 1989, and 60 percent of the \$800 million in ag sales last year.

In sum, I believe that MFN status to China should be extended for 1 more year, after which this issue will necessarily be revisited by both the President and Congress. Failure to do so will be counter-productive from both a human rights and an economic perspective.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 263 and to H.R. 2212 regarding most-favored-nation [MFN] treatment for the People's Republic of China. While some have urged revoking MFN status as a means of forcing China to respond to our concerns over human rights violations, arms proliferation, and trade disputes, I am convinced that withdrawing MFN, or attaching unattainable conditions, would actually destroy our Nation's dialog with the Chinese Government on these very issues and adversely impact

our ability to affect any positive social, political, and economic change in China.

Despite ongoing United States sanctions against China, I understand the desire of many of my colleagues to send a strong message to the leadership of China—that the United States and its people condemn the actions taken by those leaders against their own citizens in Tiananmen Square in June 1989. Like all freedom-loving Americans, I watched the violence in Tiananmen Square. It repulsed me, the same as I am sure it appalled all Americans. That kind of brutality brings forth an emotional response—the complete rejection of China's authoritarian regime. However, the issue remains: Is revoking MFN status the proper vehicle to affect change? Visceral reactions aside, I believe it is not.

Despite rhetoric to the contrary, the administration and Congress share the same long-term United States foreign policy goals in China. Both want to see greater respect for human rights, a stronger Chinese commitment to global nonproliferation objectives, an end to unfair trade practices, as well as political and economic reforms in China. At question is how best to achieve these goals. I believe strongly that renewal of MFN promotes these objectives.

While some would have the public believe that the People's Republic of China does not deserve to be treated in a most-favored manner, the fact of the matter is that the granting of MFN status to a country is not a special favor and does not mean that country receives the most favorable tariff treatment in the United States. The term most-favored-nation is itself a misnomer; MFN treatment simply refers to a policy of nondiscrimination in trade. Despite its name, MFN status is actually the standard means of conducting international trade and does not signify approval of a government or its policies.

Although it is the standard basis of trade worldwide, MFN tariff treatment is, in fact, not the lowest tariff treatment possible on exports to the U.S. The U.S. has MFN treatment agreements with 160 countries. Such treatment provides that nations will not use tariff rates to discriminate against other nations. However, over 100 developing countries also receive additional, lower tariff benefits under the generalized system of preferences [GSP], in order to promote trade-based economic development. Only 11 countries do not enjoy the benefits of GSP or an MFN relationship with the U.S. Therefore, contrary to opponents' assertions, terminating MFN for China, a developing country, would deny tariff treatment that is not only routine for most developed countries, but also already less favorable than that accorded many other developing countries.

Critics of extending MFN status also argue that the United States should punish the hardline Chinese leadership for its actions in Tiananmen Square. However, I believe that the removal of MFN would punish not so much the leadership of China as it would penalize those Chinese who United States foreign policy ostensibly seeks to help.

China's MFN status over the past decade is widely recognized to have helped bring about greater political and economic liberalization in China. Foreign trade and investment continue to keep China open to the outside world and support the economic forces that have been driving political and social change. In turn, this phenomenon has encouraged a loosening of state control and has promoted better conditions for human rights and personal freedom.

As we debate this matter, we must not overlook the harsh economic consequences the withdrawal of MFN status would have on the commercial regions of China, Hong Kong, and the many United States businesses operating throughout these countries. Loss of MFN status would result in tariff increases at least tenfold greater on the majority of China's exports to the United States. Most of these exports come from special economic zones in China's southern coastal areas. These areas have operated for years in a greatly liberalized, free-market-type of atmosphere, and are widely thought to be at odds with the leadership in Beijing over many policy issues. The loss of MFN would do far more economic damage to these entrepreneurs and reform advocates, the very people the United States wishes to cultivate, than to China's leadership or to central government revenues.

The loss of MFN status would also create enormous new problems for Hong Kong, one of America's best trading partners, at a time when the colony can least afford anything that undermines confidence in its future. The health of Hong Kong's economy is increasingly tied to the growth of south China's export industry. China is Hong Kong's largest trading partner, accounting for 39 percent of total 1990 trade. Reexports from mainland China, which grew by 20 percent in 1990, underpin Hong Kong's performance. According to the Hong Kong Government, therefore, loss of MFN status could cut Chinese reexports via Hong Kong by up to 44 percent, or \$4.6 billion.

Chinese trade retaliation, resulting from the withdrawal of MFN, which would seriously damage United States business interests in Hong Kong, and China. According to the United States State Department, the United States has the largest number of regional headquarters in Hong Kong, with over 40 percent of the 252 offices. Almost half are engaged in trading activities with China, a principal market and

source of supply. United States investment of over \$6 billion accounts for almost one-quarter of foreign direct investment in Hong Kong. A 1990 U.S. Chamber of Commerce survey indicated that 70 percent of the approximately 900 U.S. member firms would be adversely affected.

If MFN is withdrawn, Chinese trade retaliation is certain, including reciprocal loss of MFN status for United States exports to China. Since no other countries are considering withdrawing China's MFN status, United States companies would be put at a competitive disadvantage. According to the U.S. Commerce Department, major U.S. exports at stake and their sales in 1990 include: aircraft and aerospace equipment, \$749 million; wheat, \$511 million; computers and electric products, \$860 million; fertilizer, \$544 million; chemicals, \$273 million; cotton, \$259 million; and timber and paper products, \$281 million. Closer to home, Virginia exports to the People's Republic of China exceeded \$83 million in 1990 while exports to Hong Kong were approximately \$281 million. Thus, withdrawing MFN status would threaten over \$5 billion in annual United States exports, undermine \$4 billion in U.S. investments and threaten thousands of United States jobs which depend on trade with China. The United States should be promoting the removal of barriers to trade, not the erection of constraints which cost jobs in our factories and ports.

The President's renewal decision has provoked an intense debate in the Congress not only about the appropriateness of extending MFN to China, but also about United States foreign policy toward China generally. However, the debate's focus should remain, as President Bush stated recently at Yale University, on selecting a policy that has the best chance of changing Chinese behavior.

I believe that MFN is not only good trade policy, it also facilitates the development of a broad range of relations with a foreign country. This enables us to engage that country on a wide array of issues of interest to us and, if appropriate, selectively to impose sanctions in those particular areas where we have fundamental policy problems. Our relations with China have followed this pattern.

Prior to our opening of relations with Beijing in 1971, the United States sought for 2 decades to isolate China economically and politically. The United States had virtually no trade with China, few social or political contacts, and almost no ability to influence its policies. President Nixon's historic opening to China enabled us to begin to discuss with the Chinese issues of mutual concern. However, it was not until MFN status was granted to China in 1980 that our relationship accelerated and we truly began to engage the Chi-



nese on a wide range of issues. The granting of MFN also profoundly increased our access to Chinese society and our impact on economic and political reform within the country. Withdrawing or conditioning MFN status for China threatens all that we have accomplished over the past 2 decades.

Revoking MFN status for China, or placing impossible conditions on it, will effectively terminate United States-Chinese relations, once again leaving the United States without influence and abandoning reformers within China. Moreover, no other country is planning to revoke or to introduce conditionality in extending MFN to China. On the contrary, the European Community dropped its economic sanctions last October, and British, French, Japanese, and other foreign ministers recently have gone to China to normalize their trade and political relationships. Since the United States is the only country contemplating withdrawing or conditioning MFN to China, such actions would have little prospect of producing the intended results and would likely hinder, rather than stimulate, desirable reforms in China. Revoking or conditioning MFN thus would have the effect of handing the China market to our competitors.

While all Americans are deeply concerned about the Chinese Government's abysmal record on human rights, arms proliferation, and trade matters, terminating MFN will not help to improve that record. On the contrary, denial of MFN will likely worsen these problems by providing the Chinese leadership and its xenophobic hardliners with an excuse to retaliate against United States interests, further cement their authoritarian rule, encourage a return to self-imposed international isolation, and once again exclude United States political influence from that country. Such an outcome would hurt most the very reform-minded people we are interested in helping. These will be the effects of MFN withdrawal.

The bottom line is that withdrawing MFN would seriously damage United States foreign policy interests, limit our contacts with China, weaken the economic forces for reform inside China, and hurt United States businesses and consumers. Our influence over Chinese behavior would be weakened, not strengthened. We should continue MFN because it is in our national interest. It enables the United States to stay engaged with China and pursue the issues which are of vital concern to the all of us. For these reasons, I oppose withdrawing or conditioning MFN status for China and agree with the President that it is wrong to isolate China if we hope to influence it.

□ 1740

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Pelosi bill. I think it would be a mistake for Members to take away MFN status from China, and the adoption of the Solomon resolution notwithstanding, I trust that the Congress will not override the veto of that legislation which we can expect the President to hand down.

By taking away MFN from China we would accomplish very little, but it would cost the United States a good deal. I think it would also be a mistake, however, to unconditionally renew MFN for China, because if we were to do so, it would send an unfortunate signal both to the Chinese Government and to the Chinese people, that we were indifferent to the cause of human rights in that country.

The most desirable way to deal with this problem, it seems to me, is to conditionally renew MFN for China, in order to make it clear to the Chinese leaders that if they want the continued benefits of MFN, they need to make progress in the area of human rights. Unfortunately, the very sound, sensible, and sophisticated legislation originally crafted by the gentlewoman from California, for which she deserves great credit, was amended in a variety of different ways by the Committee on Ways and Means, and in a fashion which may make it objectively impossible for the Chinese Government to meet the conditions, thereby resulting in the ultimate rejection of MFN.

Consequently, I vote for the amended Pelosi bill in order to keep this process alive, and in the hope that the conferees will come to their senses and clean up the legislation so that we end up with a bill we can send to the President, which has reasonable conditions, responsible conditions, conditions which the Chinese Government can meet, and which if it does meet will result in a significant improvement in the human rights situation in China. However, it would make no sense with a whole series of conditions which cannot and will not be met because that will not advance the cause of human rights in China, but will result in all sorts of disadvantages for the United States.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I guess in some respects I sound like a broken record on this subject. I hope and pray that the message I keep delivering will be determined to be wrong. However, I cannot help but think back to January 12 and the incredible gut-wrenching vote we cast in this House to go to war against Saddam Hussein.

Now, as we debate this today, there are U.N. teams scouring Iraq, as officials accusing Saddam of lying to the United States and to the United Nations about its weapons of mass destruction, and we are today giving a

most-favored-nation status to the world's greatest proliferator of weapons of mass destruction. It is hard for me to believe, and it is very depressing.

How many more wars is it going to take for the United States to understand the path that we are on? How many more lives are going to have to be lost before we get serious about ending the proliferation of weapons? We should prosecute the New World order that President Bush so eloquently defined. We should prosecute that New World order as diligently as we prosecuted that war.

To my friends on the side issue who say if we do not sell weapons, somebody else will, as a result of our victory in Kuwait, we are the preeminent superpower of the world. What that means is that we, as the preeminent superpower, can use our authority, our clout, our prestige, to tell the world and to pressure the world into stopping the spiral of sophisticated weapons being delivered into Third World countries, and to anybody else who wants to buy them.

We should accept this bill that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has amended. I would prefer not to do this. I voted for Solomon. If this is the best we can get, this is what we ought to go with. The bottom line is, though, remember what we did on January 12. Let Members learn the lesson from it, and let Members wake up before the world spirals into a pattern of destruction caused by the sale of sophisticated strategic and nonnuclear weaponry.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes. It is prophetic that I have the opportunity to follow my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] who has eloquently discussed one of the pressing issues in this legislation; namely, the reprehensible activity of the Chinese with respect to the spread of nuclear information material and advice.

I want to address myself to that question in a moment, but I want to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from California for her extraordinary leadership on this issue. Rarely do we have someone who has been in the Chamber as briefly as the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who has had such an extraordinary impact on the direction of this particular issue. We are all in her debt for the work she has done.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] made the point about the proliferation of nuclear materials. Let me just read for Members a number of things that are public information.

One, the continued aid to Pakistan's covert nuclear weapons program, including nuclear materials, nuclear weapons design information, and critical information about nuclear reactor technology. They have secretly supplied a nuclear reactor to Algeria and

denied having done so. They supplied low enriched uranium reprocessing technology to Iraq, and have supplied unsafeguarded nuclear materials to Argentina. They have sold enriched uranium to Brazil. Now, what our conditions require in the amended Pelosi language is nothing more than already exists in law. Today, the President, under 99-183, the Agreement for Nuclear Cooperation between the United States and China, passed in 1985, specifies that the President submit to the Speaker and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a report detailing the history and current developments in non-proliferation policies and practices of the People's Republic of China.

□ 1750

No such report has ever been submitted.

In the last session of the Congress, Public Law 101-246, the China sanctions bill which passed the House less than a month after Tiananmen Square, contained additional language concerning nuclear cooperation between the two countries, and it specifies the clear and unequivocal assurance to the United States that it is not assisting any other country in developing nuclear weapons devices or materials for such devices, and such certification has not been able to be given by the President.

So Pelosi, as amended by Rostenkowski, is the way to go if you want to express your concern about the proliferation of nuclear weapons materials and information and devices to the Chinese. There is no other way to do it, because the existing laws have not worked. This is the only opportunity we have to get the attention of the Chinese to stop what my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has talked about, this willful disregard for global opinion about the spread of nuclear weapons technology.

The Chinese have to be stopped, Pelosi, as amended by Rostenkowski, does that.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her hard work on this legislation. I think she has done a tremendous service to the Congress with all this effort.

Am I my broker's keeper? Yet bet I am. I think we all are. We all believe in human rights. We all believe in our fellow man, and yet I hear some of my colleagues on the floor today say in essence, "Let's close our eyes to what is going on the Communist China." I cannot do that, and I do not think anybody who really thinks about it should.

There are 10 million people in Communist gulags in Communist China

today, many of whom are participating in a slave labor program to export goods to the rest of the world, including the United States. It is estimated that last year we got \$100 million in products from Communist China that were made by slave labor in these 3,000 Communist gulags that have 10 million people in them. Those people stay in those prisons until they die. About 30 percent get out. The other 70 percent stay there.

Nuclear proliferation is a major issue, I grant you that.

The economic considerations we are talking about here today that affect Americans, that is important as well. But what about the 10 million people who are suffering in those gulags today and are literally slaves, making products that we consume in this country? Do we not care about them?

I say we should. For God's sake, we should, and then we think about those young men and women who wanted freedom in Tiananmen Square. Have we forgotten about them? Have we forgotten the Statue of Liberty replica that they erected in Tiananmen Square telling the world that they wanted the things that we hold dear, freedom, democracy, and liberty?

And yet what happened? We watched horrified on television as tanks came in and they literally ground those young patriots into dog meat, and we stand here today saying, "Let's close our eyes to that and give this Communist regime, this tyrannical regime, most-favored-nation status." I say no.

We need to send a signal not only to the Communist Chinese, but to the rest of the world that we stand for human rights, that we know there is a cost to be paid and we are willing to pay it, because we believe in our fellow man. To do less, in my opinion, is criminal.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2212, the Pelosi bill, conditioning the extension of most-favored-nation trading status for the People's Republic of China on genuine human rights reforms and arms control activities. Congress has threatened to do this ever since the brutal crackdowns symbolized by the massacre in Tiananmen Square. China has repeatedly ignored our concerns and our warnings.

However, I must say I am concerned about attaching too many conditions with too many or unrealistic aims. Our objective is to persuade the Chinese Government to change directions and return to the process of economic and political reform which was moving slowly, but at least moving positively, prior to June 1989. Realistically, we cannot expect a total transformation from Communist dictatorship to free democracy overnight. Setting conditions that basically require such a transformation will not yield the positive results we want. Rather, I believe they will push the hard-line Chinese Government in the opposite direction

ruining our already strained relations. We just don't know how far we can push China. I believe we should set realistic goals, require China to meet them and move on from there. In other words, we should attach conditions, but reasonable and responsible ones.

I believe that the Communist Chinese Government must be held accountable for the murder and continued imprisonment of thousands of peaceful prodemocracy supporters whose only crime was to publicly ask for greater freedom and democracy. Sadly, this is not the first time the Communist regime in China has used violence and bloodshed to enforce its will. Since seizing power in 1949, hundreds of thousands—some claim scores of millions—of Chinese as well as countless Tibetans have been murdered by the Communist Government. The overwhelmingly brutal force used by the Chinese Army to destroy the prodemocracy movement is abhorrent. The false charges and sham tribunals used to convict student leaders and sentence them to death by firing squad are outrageous, but should not have surprised anyone. Arrests and political harassment continue today throughout China and Tibet. Like many of my colleagues, I have already cosponsored and voted for resolutions that strongly denounce the brutal Chinese Government and protest all of its repressive measures. China cannot claim it has not been warned.

We have not stood idly by. Immediately following the Chinese Army's bloody attack on the student demonstrators in Beijing, the United States, through the White House, Congress and the State Department, strongly condemned the Chinese Government's action and President Bush invoked a set of punitive sanctions in response to this cruelty. These sanctions include suspension of all military cooperation and military sales, including commercial military deals; suspension of high-technology transfers and sales; suspension of any further meetings between senior United States officials and their Chinese counterparts; and postponing any consideration of supporting Chinese applications for loans from international lending institutions. I encouraged and strongly support these sanctions.

In addition, the mayhem created by the Chinese Government has resulted in the imposition of other informal economic sanctions. The evacuation of the vast majority of western businessmen and technical consultants has crippled many of China's industries, especially those involved in modernization and generation of much needed export earnings.

Events in China do affect our national security and global stability. For example, China could have, but it didn't, oppose our actions in the United Nations and in the Persian Gulf. A Chinese veto of any of the U.N. resolutions could have had tremendously negative implications for Operation Desert Shield/Storm.

As a nuclear power and major arms dealer, I am also concerned that a negative reaction by China to our MFN actions could result in China ignoring our efforts to halt the arms race in the Middle East, South Asia and elsewhere. That could be very detrimental to our national security interests.

While I recognize the importance of our relations with China and hope these ties will not be further damaged, the lack of real improve-



ment in the situation in China and the continued repression warrants tougher economic as well as political pressures. However, as I said, we must be very discriminating with any new sanctions to ensure that we are targeting the Chinese government, not the Chinese people who are trying to help. That is a difficult challenge.

During consideration of the fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1991 foreign assistance authorization bill I strongly supported an amendment instituting a more expansive set of sanctions against the Chinese Government. Among the new sanctions contained in the legislation are suspensions of Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC] activities, nuclear cooperation with China, trade and development agency programs, and munitions export licenses. I voted for these measures as well as for the bill, which passed the House. I also cosponsored, supported and voted for H.R. 2712, the legislation that protected Chinese students here in the United States from retribution from the Communist government.

I do not support the continuation of most-favored-nation [MFN] status for China unless it is conditioned by strict, certified Chinese adherence to human rights conditions. In other words, if China wants to retain MFN status—which due to the high volume of exports to the United States I believe the Chinese very much do—then real progress must be made on human rights. While almost every country in the world has MFN trading status and while I do not like to link trade issues with political ones, I feel this is one of the only ways left for us to influence China. Prior to the bloody massacre in Tiananmen Square in June 1989, I was encouraged by both the economic and political reforms being made by China. Sadly, the Chinese Government continues to move in the opposite direction today. While there is a real chance that the Chinese Government could react negatively to conditioning MFN status, punishing Chinese prodemocracy supporters and our global initiatives for actions by the United States, I also believe that there is a chance that it could provide the Chinese Government with an incentive to reverse current abuses and, once again, follow the path of real reform.

Denying MFN status to China will cost American consumers, particularly those in lower income brackets. Many inexpensive items, like everyday shoes and clothing as well as children's toys and inexpensive household items are manufactured in China. Due to international trade quotas and comparative advantages, replacing these items at the same low cost will be difficult at best. Because some of the goods imported from China require final manufacturing here in the United States, some American jobs could be at risk if MFN trading status is denied. Further, since we will be alone in these economic sanctions against China, I am concerned about the loss of American business to Japanese, Europeans, and others. In addition, we should be aware that Chinese trade with these other countries will mitigate the effects of our MFN denial on the Chinese.

The future of MFN trading status for China will also affect the transition of Hong Kong from its protected status of a British crown colony to an integral part of China as scheduled

to take place in 1997. Further, concerns have been raised that those who benefit most from economic exchanges with the United States and working with American businesses in China—students, reform-minded business leaders, workers and so on, will be hurt most denying MFN trade status.

However, despite the possible political and economic costs, I continue to believe that the morally right course of action is to apply realistic human rights conditions to MFN trade status for China. I hope, at the end of the day, we have a package of conditions that are acceptable to Congress and the Administration and will positively influence the Chinese to change their brutal ways. While a better package of conditions might be devised and I hope will be, I believe the best way to proceed at this time is with the Pelosi bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS].

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, more than a decade ago, I helped negotiate trade agreements for this country as special assistant to the United States Trade Representative. I helped implement our first trade agreement with the People's Republic of China, the one that gave them most-favored-nation status in 1980. That was a time of great hope.

Today those hopes are threatened. More than 2 years have passed since the tanks rolled in Tiananmen Square, and it is past time to stop kowtowing to the Communist leadership in China. If we vote to extend MFN without conditions, we will be telling the Chinese Government that whatever they do to their own people and whatever crimes they commit against all humanity, we Americans nevertheless will continue to conduct business as usual.

However, if we vote for conditional renewal, we will be true to our principles as well as our interests.

We must prove, Mr. Speaker, that as much as we believe in the undeniable benefits of freer expanding trade, we believe even more in the fundamental human rights of all people.

Numerous American businesses have urged me to support extending MFN for China without conditions. Many are in my own district. They have come to me one at a time and I have asked each one of them in turn, "What, if anything, could the Chinese Government ever do that would be so wrong, so terrible that you would want to withhold or condition MFN?" Not one of them has given me an answer.

As the first former trade negotiator for this country to serve in this House, I know that trade is important; but I know, too, that America must stand for something more than merely the almighty dollar.

A few weeks ago, I had dinner in Florida with Zheng Hongye, the Chairman of the Chinese Trade Ministry. For more than 3 hours, we debated intensely the issues that entangle our

two nations. Again and again, I pressed him hard on the urgent need for reforms in China now. Finally, he held up his hand to call a halt, and he told me firmly that China and the United States are simply two different cultures, with two different histories and two entirely different kinds of values and that they should not be judged by the values that we hold dear.

I reminded him then of that most basic of human values that not only permeates all American thought, but also was voiced long ago by that greatest of all Chinese philosophers, Confucius: "All men are brothers."

Mr. Speaker, all men are brothers, and all men and all women in China and everywhere on this planet are entitled to basic human rights. The need for freedom, the longing for freedom, is universal, indivisible, and undeniable. The Chinese people deserve a real chance for freedom. By voting today for H.R. 2212, by imposing realistic conditions on the extension of MFN beyond this year, we can give them that chance, and we can remind the world anew that we Americans believe, as Confucius believes, that all men truly are brothers.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the highly respected Republican leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, this is an issue on which men and women of identical ideology, I guess, and philosophies, can differ on the issue that is before us today.

I rise to oppose the proposal of the gentlewoman from California. The conditions embodied in her bill make it tantamount to a total rejection of most-favored-nation status, and that is why I oppose it.

□ 1800

I think it is generally understood that foreign policy questions should be decided on the basis of our national interest, yes, and of our values. So let me first turn to the question of our interests.

United States exports to China this year are expected to total about \$5.5 billion. Concerning major exports, their sales as of 1990 are: in the area of aircraft, \$749 million; fertilizer, \$544 million; cereals, \$512 million; cotton yarn and fabric, \$281 million; electric machinery, \$264 million; wood products, \$238 million; and chemicals, \$273 million.

In my home State of Illinois, in 1990, they had exports worth \$337 million to Hong Kong and China. Other States around the country can show similar gains.

Hong Kong, in which the United States has long been the largest foreign investor, will be devastated by the loss of most-favored-nation status for China.

I am reminded of the comments of the President this morning as members of the joint leadership sat around the conference table in the Cabinet room discussing this particular issue. The President discussed a number of other issues, particularly G-7, the meeting that was upcoming, and all the other issues that will come before that group.

But the President, as a matter of fact, in answer to a question that I posed concerning this measure this afternoon, offered his view. What would be the reaction of those who would be gathering next week in the G-7 group and all the other countries, if we, for example, were to deny MFN status to China? And he pointed out particularly our British friends and allies and their feelings with respect to Hong Kong and what happens a few years down the pike with Hong Kong and all the rest of it, affects us very, very directly in more ways than one.

Yes, it is true we have a large trade imbalance with China, but the Chinese are responding to that concern with new trade initiatives.

Moreover, not one country in the world is going to restrict their trade with China even if we do, and that means that we will be giving up our current and future share of the Chinese market to other nations.

Some say, "Well, this is only an economic question. What about our values?" I will get to that. But for the time being, on this issue of economics and being a competitor worldwide: I hear colleagues on the floor of this House bashing Japan, bashing West Germany, whomever, for unfair competition or whatever. Yet here we are with a billion people in the country of China, all of whom are striving for a better way of life, hopefully. Yes, it has been set back a great deal by what happened in Tiananmen Square. But we opened the door at one time and everybody's hearts were lifted by the fact that here was going to be a billion people who were going to have a better way of life and were going to enjoy the fruits of free trade among nations. And it seems rather ridiculous, ludicrous, that we should give our competitors an edge. People are down here on the floor of the House every day talking about how we are getting outfoxed, outmaneuvered, how can we be competitive again? And we are giving our opposition the advantage not only for today but in future years by doing to ourselves what we ought not to be doing.

And finally, American consumers will be paying substantially higher prices for goods made by the Chinese. There are those protectionists who say, "Block the doors, don't let anything in. We can make it all better." Well, yes, maybe we can on some of those items. But there is a difference, a cost differential. That is not the only item.

But the whole community of nations eventually, with that potential market out there, cannot be denied. We are a country that, frankly, can produce so much more than we can consume industrially and agriculturally. That is three strikes, as I pointed out here, and guess who is going to be struck out? Not the Chinese Communist leaders, not our global competitors, only American workers and their families.

Economic facts strongly support retaining MFN. Issues such as arms sales by the Chinese and nuclear proliferation are not going to be helped if we turn our backs on China. We do much better keeping the lines of communication open.

But even the best economic or foreign policy arguments do not matter if our national values are ignored.

So let us turn to MFN status in light of our values.

We are told we should not reward China for the atrocities of its leaders. That is true; cannot argue with that.

Our national values dictate that evil should never be rewarded. But did the United States reward Mao Tse-Tung in the 1970's by establishing diplomatic and economic ties with his regime after they had killed millions? No.

To the contrary, we established contacts with Mao's cruel regime in order to help as many of the Chinese people as possible. Not their leaders, but the people.

Playing the Chinese card was a pragmatic move, but it also reflected our basic values. As for human rights questions in Communist China, the issue has never been whether its rulers would be the beneficiaries of our trade, but the much broader one of whether the Chinese people would be the beneficiaries of American trade. And they have and will be all the more so as we move to expand our trade with China in future years.

Let me turn for a moment to our colleagues, especially those on my side of the aisle, who have long been engaged in the fight against communism. Many of us opposed Chinese communism in the days when it was not fashionable to do so, when we were told by some experts that the Chinese Communists were only agrarian reformers. Boy, how I remember that argument back in the late 1940's and 1950's when I first came to Washington.

So I know how you feel about Chinese communism. But principled anticommunism has always involved supporting policies that help the victims of communism. In the special case of China, and China has always got to be considered a special case, continuing engagement helps the Chinese people and serves our interests and our values.

Taking away most-favored-nation status is the diplomatic equivalent of carpet bombing the very people we are trying to help, in order to hit their leaders.

We need only turn to the words of Gao Xin, the journalist who was one of the last four hunger strikers on Tiananmen Square on June 14, 1989, to get it straight, and he says,

Cancelling MFN would help hard-liners. If MFN is withdrawn, the United States will lose the critical leverage needed to help the Chinese people.

The students of Tiananmen Square said, "Reach out your hand, reach out my hand, reach out our hands."

Will we continue to reach out our hands to the Chinese people through trade? Or will we withdraw the hand of comfort and hope and freedom from the Chinese people?

You know, there is no American interest and no American value served by abandoning the Chinese people, the whole of the Chinese people, because of their rulers' crimes. I would strongly urge that we support the President, support our national interests and our values and support the suffering Chinese people by upholding most-favored-nation status.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER.]

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I begin by commending the gentlewoman from California for her leadership and for her commitment to human rights for all the people of China.

We would not be here today if China had not machinegunned and crushed hundreds of innocent students in Tiananmen Square in 1989. We would not be discussing this legislation if Chinese troops had not killed hundreds of Buddhist monks and Tibetans in Lhasa earlier that year. We would not be considering conditioning MFN if they had not hunted down and executed without trial thousands of innocent Chinese intellectuals and students whose only crime was to long for and work for democracy and pluralism within their country and had not put on show trials for others while United States attention was riveted in the Persian Gulf. We would not be concerned about MFN and China, if the leaders in Beijing had not authorized sales of sophisticated arms to renegade states like Iraq and Libya or helped Algeria build a nuclear reactor capable of producing weapons grade materials.

Despite all that, Mr. Speaker, we would not be here considering this measure if there has been any substantial recognition by the Beijing regime of standards of human rights and individual freedom.

But, Mr. Speaker, there has been none. Oh, yes, they hired Hill and Knowlton recently to polish up their image on the Hill. And they have done a few other public relations measures of a cosmetic nature to attempt to look good. But the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that there has been no progress since Tiananmen Square, no realization of how far out of step China



is under this regime with civilized standards and the direction of almost all other nations on the planet, no regret, no change in the direction they have taken down the road of repression, torture, and denial of the rights of the Chinese people.

The gentlelady from California has provided the Chinese leaders with clear guidance of what we expect of our relationship. We are not saying that we wish to cut off diplomatic relations, or to eliminate communication or cooperation with China. All we are saying is that we have markets valuable to the Chinese; that the trade balance is greatly in their favor; and that where there is no sharing of values, no coalescence of principles; we can think of no reason why they should have access to our markets with the same privileges as are enjoyed by nations who believe as we do.

I would also like to mention one provision of the Pelosi bill that I think is very important but that often gets overlooked next to all the other provisions. That is the condition that the President may not recommend MFN unless the President certifies that China is adhering to the spirit of the Sino-British joint declaration.

In 1984, Great Britain and the People's Republic of China signed the Sino-British joint declaration. This document sets the conditions under which Hong Kong will revert to Chinese control in 1997. The joint declaration guarantees that the people of Hong Kong will be allowed to maintain their governmental, judicial, and economic institutions for at least 50 years after the Chinese take control of Hong Kong.

In contrast to China, Hong Kong has a long history of economic freedom and prosperity. In addition, democratic institutions are developing at a rapid rate in Hong Kong. This September, the people of Hong Kong will go to the polls to elect members of the Legislative Council, Hong Kong's parliament, for the first time.

The Joint Declaration is the people of Hong Kong's only guarantee that China will not trample on their rights and impose a strict totalitarian regime as soon as it takes control in 1997. But the only incentive that China has to adhere to this agreement is international insistence that China meet its obligations. Conditioning MFN on China standing by its agreements relating to Hong Kong is exactly the type of pressure we must keep on China to preserve Hong Kong's freedom.

I thank the gentlewoman for including this important provision and for all of her hard work to bring this important bill to the floor. I urge Members to support the people of China and the people of Hong Kong and vote for the Pelosi bill.

□ 1810

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2212, legislation conditioning the extension of most-favored-nation status to the People's Republic of China. This legislation will restore balance to the United States-Sino relationship by reinvigorating American credibility on human rights issues in China.

Conditional extension of MFN will afford us valuable leverage over the behavior of the Chinese Government. However, we should remember that this leverage is not unlimited. With over 4 billion dollars in American investment in China, America has much to lose if revocation of MFN results in virtual collapse in Chinese trade relations. Our allies will not similarly revoke trade relations with China. They will surely rush to fill markets we abandon. While a stable trade relationship with low tariffs may be more valuable to the Chinese economy than to the American economy, we must be careful not to overplay our hand. If we do so, and load so many conditions onto the extension of MFN that the Chinese have little incentive to comply, then we will only have shown that once again the Americans have failed to grasp the essence of the Sino-American relationship. In an attempt to gain leverage over the Chinese Government, we will have lost any influence we might have had.

As a result, I opposed House Joint Resolution 263, the Solomon resolution, much as I sympathize with the frustrations of the sponsors. I will also oppose the en bloc amendments to the Pelosi bill which attach so many conditions, however worthwhile, to the extension of MFN that the concept of leverage is lost.

The en bloc amendment seeks to achieve several objectives which I wholly support. The U.S. Government must move aggressively to prevent the import of goods manufactured with prison labor, imports which already violate other statutes. I am fully in support of measures to press the Chinese to halt missile sales to Pakistan and Syria, and to place nuclear technology sold to Algeria under strict international control. Last, I want to reiterate my strenuous opposition to Chinese Government policies involving coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization. But on procedural grounds alone, I must oppose this en bloc amendment. I simply do not believe that attaching this list of provisions to the extension of MFN will change Chinese Government policy one bit. Instead, I believe the Chinese will walk away from the table and American policy will have achieved nothing, least of all progress on the human rights provisions included in the Pelosi bill as it stands now.

sions included in the Pelosi bill as it stands now.

The administration opposes the conditioning of MFN status to China. They argue that the United States Government now has the diplomatic tools available to improve the human rights situation in China and Tibet, to stop missile sales to the Mideast and Asia, to press successfully for wider market access for American Goods in China and better protections for American intellectual property. The administration is right—the tools are there, and if the President had used them aggressively earlier, I believe Congress would not be debating the issue of MFN today.

The administration also claims that MFN is a blunderbuss, and an awkward tool to try to influence Chinese policy. Again the administration is right. Once MFN were cut off, the United States would have to renegotiate another trade treaty with the Chinese in order to restore it in the future. American business, which has relied on a stable trading relationship with China since the completion of the last trade treaty with China in 1980, would take large losses as it struggled to adjust over \$4 billion in American investment in China to a drastically worsened bilateral trade relationship. American software manufacturers would lose any protections they might have hoped to gain through current negotiations on intellectual property now ongoing between the American and Chinese Governments.

Perhaps worst of all, cutting off MFN would most hurt the strongest force for social and economic change left in China—the entrepreneurs and businessmen. These capitalists, located primarily in the southern coastal provinces of Guangdong and Fujian, have gamely struggled on in spite of the political crackdown emanating from Beijing to their north. These dynamic economic forces, so important for the survival of the Hong Kong economy as well as the future of reform in China, rely heavily on the export trade for a living. Disapproving MFN would strike at the heart of the Chinese entrepreneur by virtually denying him access to the American market.

Issues demanding immediate attention in the United States-Sino relationship are numerous; but so too are the tools available to the President to press the American case. I would like to see the President move much more vigorously to use these other tools at his command, particularly in the human rights and international political arenas. Congress has resorted to MFN as a last resort—it is indeed a clumsy weapon. I believe we would be much more effective as a nation in advancing all of these causes if we focused the extension of MFN status on the resolution of the thorny trade problems we now have with the Chinese

Government. Our trade deficit with China last year was over \$10 billion and is likely to increase over 20 percent this year. In spite of a commitment in the 1980 trade treaty to implement intellectual property protections, the Chinese refuse to respect foreign copyrights. The American software industry loses over \$400 million a year in pirated software. Chinese investment barriers and obstacles to market access are the subject of ongoing talks but little progress is being made. In sum, MFN is a trade tool, and is likely to be most effective in resolving bilateral trade issues.

Mr. Speaker, the hardline elements who yet run the Chinese Government may still believe, as did the emperors of old, that they are the center of the universe. Their intransigence on matters of human rights, proliferation, market access, and intellectual property reflects an arrogance that only an emperor could dare adopt. H.R. 2212, the Pelosi bill, shows the Chinese Government that the torture of even one Chinese is a matter of worldwide concern, not an issue of domestic politics which they can refuse to discuss with impunity. While I would have preferred to use tools other than MFN to press this point, China must now realize that America will stand behind its principles—and that the arrogance of the past is unacceptable when principles of human rights are at stake.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, granting MFN status to the People's Republic of China is in many peoples eyes tantamount to an endorsement of human rights abuses, the sale of nuclear technology to Third World despots, and totalitarian dictatorship.

This body can grant Red China's regime preferential trading status, but it can not play Pontius Pilate. We can not wash away responsibility while we condone a regime which would have every Member of this House exiled, jailed, tortured, or executed.

Those who favor MFN for this Communist regime, claim it will result in a loosening of tyranny, an impetus to democratization. It is now 2 years after the Tiananmen Square massacre, and the hoped-for improvements in human rights and political freedom are nowhere to be seen. In fact, the situation is getting worse.

The idea that MFN will bring liberalization is just that, an idea—not a reality. It is an illusion which permits us to treat a ghoulish regime with the dignity and respect afforded to decent and honorable governments. Face the reality: Our colleague, Mr. WOLF, has been in China and he tells us the Chinese are using slave labor to manufacture products for export. According to a Nanking City yearbook, engines produced by prisoners working at the

Yinshau diesel engine plant "have sold well in Hong Kong, Australia, and Southeast Asia." Similarly, the Fuzhou City yearbook reported that "reform-through-labor camps of Fujian Province and their counterparts in 12 other provinces and cities are used to earn foreign exchange revenue and to promote an export-oriented economy."

Many of the Tiananmen Square demonstrators are still in prison, and if we allow the continuation of the status quo, the only message that Beijing will receive will be that its savage repression of the prodemocracy demonstrators was OK with us. The arrest and execution of democratic leaders is of little concern—profiting from slave labor is no big deal. Our actions today will speak much louder than our words.

On June 21, 1989, the PRC began executing individuals accused of committing "crimes" during the prodemocracy demonstrations on Tiananmen Square. In response, Secretary Baker expressed deep regret.

Instead of new sanctions, on July 7, 1989 the State Department allowed a waiver on military sales to China. In December Mr. Eagleburger and General Scowcroft met with high-level Chinese officials despite the prohibition on such meetings. What kind of message are we sending to the criminal regime in Beijing? What message are we sending to the democratic reformers and students who languish in prison or who risk death or imprisonment to keep the hope for freedom alive.

Ask our colleague CHRIS SMITH about religious persecution in China. This regime is murdering Christians, closing Mosques, and doing its best to stamp out any belief in God. Ask our colleague TOM LANTOS about the massacres going on in Tibet. This is genocide, there is no other definition. You can use other words to try to paint another picture, if it is an illusion. The problem is not the aging leadership in Beijing, but their morality, their unrepentant belief in the Communist system itself. This gang not only represses its own people, but sells advanced weapons to Burma, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and others. They transfer nuclear weapons technology to Iran, Algeria and perhaps other nut-ball regimes. They are rapidly becoming an outlaw nation—and should be treated like a pariah, not a business partner.

During this debate let us acknowledge that the People's Republic of China is not the only China. Instead of ignoring the abuse of power on the mainland, we should be lauding the progress towards democracy being made on Taiwan, the other China. The Chinese on Taiwan and mainland share the same culture and history. Taiwan is a showcase, the mainland is a basket case. The reason is found in the political philosophy that dominates these two Chinas. Taiwan's 22 million people outproduce China's 1.1 billion. They

have more freedom, enjoy greater political and social freedom, and they can worship God as they see fit and they don't pose a military threat to anyone.

Not only should we not be granting special privileges for the regime on the mainland, we should be taking positive steps toward free China. The freer China would like our recognition of the economic and political role it plays. Lets reward the China that is doing whats right, and quit making excuses for the bad guys.

I hope that those who are willing to support MFN for China are also willing to support Radio Free Asia, to acknowledge democracy on Taiwan, and to condemn the Chinese involvement with tyrants in Burma and Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, I have a stake in this decision. In my district is the largest harbor on the west coast. Many of the large aerospace firms which do business in China are my constituents. But short-term profits are an illusion. A longer view, calls for steps that secure a deep friendship with those Chinese who believe in democracy in China. They are our allies in spirit and soul, they will prevail over the evil that has engulfed their homeland and when they do, they should know we were on their side, and the side of freedom and democracy, all along.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, the picture of China sketched before us in today's debate is not one that any of us can view favorably, but rather with despair. International organizations tell us that the human rights situation there has worsened, not improved. Prison labor is used to build products to export to the United States. China thumbs its nose at the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and ships destabilizing arms to countries like Iraq, Iran, and, apparently, to Syria. Since Tiananmen Square, Chinese exports to the United States have doubled, while United States exports to China have shrunk. Today only one country—Japan—enjoys a greater trade surplus with the United States than does China.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the primary focus of today's debate is how the Chinese Government treats its own citizens, its own workers. However, I would like to raise the issue of how China has treated a number of workers in our own country.

Four years ago, a steel plant in Claymont, DE, closed its doors, idling over 600 workers. A year later, the plant was bought amidst great hope by Citisteel, a subsidiary of the China International Trust and Investment Corporation, which is an agency of the Chinese Government.

The plant's unemployed steelworkers and their union helped Citisteel obtain special State clearances so that the



plant's start up could be expedited. In return, the former Phoenix employees believed they would have a fair opportunity to fill the new positions at Citisteel. Instead, the new Chinese owners have consistently demonstrated a lack of respect for those American workers and their representatives.

Today 300 people work at Citisteel. Two hundred former Phoenix employees applied for positions, only 35 were hired.

This past May, the National Labor Relations Board ruled that Citisteel was violating the rights of its American workers and was guilty of discriminatory employment hirings practices.

To add insult to injury, Citisteel has refused to acknowledge the existence of the union which represented the former steelworkers and to date has not responded to a hand-delivered letter to the Chinese Embassy.

As we consider most-favored-nation status for China, I hope my colleagues will keep in mind not only how China has treated its own citizens, but in this one particular case, how they have treated a group of American workers here in our country.

There is something to be said for consistency. The Chinese have been consistent both at home and abroad. Should the reward for that nation's consistency be to give them most-favored-nation trading status without conditions? I hope not and urge support of the Pelosi bill.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, as the premier democratic legislative body in the world, we have an obligation to reflect American values to the world. In this regard, there is no serious dissent that the sentiments reflected in the Pelosi bill are expressive of consensus American politics and social philosophy.

What does exist, however, is a division of opinion on how best to advance within China a freer and more solidly founded ethic of democracy and human rights. Here the question advocates of the Pelosi approach must examine is the question of means, not ends, whether self-righteous congressional indignation advances or undercuts a just cause.

What is at issue is less a question of indignation than judgment—how Americans can play a role in moderating Chinese policies and liberalizing Chinese institutions. If history is a guide, it would appear that almost every effort to coerce China through economic isolation has not only failed but accentuated unpredictable xenophobic nationalism. On the other hand, almost every U.S. step toward constructive dialog has been met with a liberalized response.

Relations between states are always evolving. At issue is external as well as internal politics.

Generally speaking, government-to-government policies have the least effect on how countries structure their internal affairs, but often have substantial effect on how they structure their foreign policy. Here, this Congress must understand that in terms of the profoundest issue in international politics today—war and peace—China has generally been moving in a progressive direction.

To be particularly poignant, in terms of the gulf war, China was more consistently supportive of the President of the United States in voting in the United Nations Security Council than the majority American political party was in voting in the United States Congress.

With regard to the current situation in the Middle East, supporters of the Pelosi approach are correct in pointing out the destabilizing implications of past Chinese missile and nuclear sales to the region. Yet, if there is to be any hope of establishing, within the framework of a new world order, agreements on arms restraint, whether it be on international approaches symbolized by the NPT, to which I hope China will accede in the very near future, or regional arms control in the Middle East, China's cooperation—such as that evidenced yesterday in Paris with the tentative agreement by the permanent five members of the Security Council—will be vital.

No one in this Chamber should doubt that playing games with normal trade—daring to isolate China—jeopardizes the security of the State of Israel and any hope of reasonable arms restraint in the Middle East.

The irony that undergirds this frustration-laden legislative lodestone is that American foreign policy is on a roll.

Free enterprise, free trade, free politics, are gathering momentum in virtually every corner of the globe. The American Presidency in 1991 has never been more vindicated nor more generally acknowledged as the pinnacle of world leadership than at any time in the history of this country, save perhaps 1918 and 1945.

I recognize that in areas of foreign commerce the Constitution gives plenary authority to the Congress. Yet in a world in transition, a world in which a half-century hallmarked by geopolitics is giving way to one driven by geoeconomics, this Congress would be well advised to give the benefit of the doubt to a nondivisive, bi-institutional, bipartisan, approach to Sino-American relations. After all, what is at stake is the future of our relations with one-fifth of the world's population.

In this context, termination of MFN for China would have the perverse effect of most severely impacting on those elements of Chinese society we most want to support: The reformist provincial officials and entrepreneurial

business people and traders in south China, especially those along the Pearl River Delta.

Revocation of MFN would strengthen the hand of hardliners in Beijing who seek the reimposition of bureaucratic controls over the flourishing nonstate sector of the economy and who advocate reinstatement of Marxist orthodoxy in politics, philosophy, the arts, and science.

Revocation of MFN would seriously jeopardize the future of Hong Kong as well as Taiwan, and from an American agricultural perspective, revocation of MFN would be the equivalent of placing yet another embargo on soybean sales. Our action would be entirely unilateral and wholly out of step with the rest of the world. Two years after Tiananmen, no American ally is prepared to follow our lead.

Most importantly, revocation of MFN would reverse our historic "open door" policy to China in favor of a counterproductive "bolted door" approach, unilaterally ceding our progressive influence to the influence of others or possibly moving the world's largest country in a chaotic autarkic direction.

At issue from the perspective of the Chinese people is whether their country is economically going to be brought into the 21st century à la Taiwan or à la Ethiopia. Here let me remind this body that just 30 years ago, just prior to the cultural revolution, 2 million people starved to death in a single Chinese prefecture. Does this Congress dare suggest that it is a humanitarian policy to slam shut America's traditional open door policy and shut down the free enterprise movement that has allowed China to feed its population, to plant the seeds of a free political movement?

At a time in history when the nexus between commerce, diplomacy, and the roots of national power is becoming ever more manifest, a quixotic policy of economic self-abnegation toward the world's most populous country would represent the apogee of congressional folly.

Defeat this self-defeating legislation.

□ 1820

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, let me express my sincere appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the distinguished chairman, for yielding time to me. I also want to commend the distinguished gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for the magnificent leadership that she has provided on this issue from the very moment that the tanks murdered the Chinese students in Tiananmen Square.

Mr. SPEAKER, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2212, a bill to place stringent human rights conditions on the

renewal of most-favored-nation [MFN] trade benefits for the People's Republic of China.

More than 2 years have passed since the brutal massacre at Tiananmen Square, when hundreds of prodemocracy demonstrators were killed by Chinese troops. Thousands of demonstrators were arrested; many were executed; others remain in prison even today. In the meantime, the Chinese leadership has continued to arrest political dissidents, extract forced labor from prisoners, and suppress free speech and assembly.

In addition to these clear violations of internationally recognized human rights, the Chinese Government has contributed to the proliferation of ballistic missiles and nuclear technology; and run up a huge trade surplus with the United States based, at least partially, on forced labor.

This continuing pattern of gross violations of international law proves one thing beyond any doubt: that President Bush's policy of accommodating and defending the Chinese hardline government has completely and dramatically failed.

Indeed, not only has the policy been unsuccessful, it may actually have contributed to the obstinacy of the Chinese Government, which continues to ignore its international obligations.

Yet even though the President's hands-off policy has manifestly failed, he has again asked Congress to give China unconditional trade benefits. The House of Representatives overwhelmingly rejected this view last year—and we should do so again today.

The legislation before the House, H.R. 2212, includes a very simple and sensible approach to United States trade policy in China. The bill does not suspend MFN—in fact, it explicitly allows for the continuation of MFN benefits for 1991. But the bill stipulates that the President cannot extend trade benefits in 1992 unless he certifies that China has met certain human rights conditions.

I urge my colleagues to give their strong support to this legislation. Given the President's threat to veto any conditions on the renewal of MFN, this body will be sending two signals with this vote: first to the Chinese Government, whose policies have made them the object of worldwide condemnation; and second, to President Bush, who apparently needs to be reminded that his China policy has no support in Congress or among the American people.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2212. While I commend my close friend and colleague the gentlewoman from California, Ms. PELOSI, for her leader-

ship on this issue, I do not feel the legislation goes far enough. In order to immediately address U.S. national security, economic and human rights concerns we should not hesitate to send the clearest message we possibly can to the Communist leadership in Beijing: That we will no longer tolerate missile and nuclear sales; that we will no longer tolerate a \$15 billion trade deficit earned on the back of American labor and political prisoners; and, we will no longer tolerate the occupation of Tibet and the ruthless repression of prodemocracy forces in China. I believe that the best way to send such a message is by cutting off MFN.

However, my good friend, the gentlewoman from California, has high hopes and noble intentions and if her legislation becomes law we must see that its every word and thought is followed through by specific deeds and action. If what we want is the end to the Communist hardliners regime in Beijing, and not just the regime's loosening its hold on a few key dissidents, we cannot continue to prop it up by paying its bills year after year.

Despite my reservations, I believe that Ms. PELOSI's bill is well thought out and I believe if it becomes law it may very well lead to the cutoff of MFN in 1 year. Hopefully, China will listen. Accordingly, I support H.R. 2212 and commend Ms. PELOSI for her outstanding leadership for human rights in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Pelosi bill and in favor of renewing China's most-favored-nation status. While I am in disagreement with the administration's position that this privilege should be granted unconditionally, this is not an easy side to take. The gruesome memories of the events that occurred in Tiananmen Square just 2 years ago are still vivid in my mind, and the knowledge of the continued repression of human rights is equally disturbing. Several other factors must be considered, before following a path that would only serve to isolate the Chinese rather than draw them closer to the international norms of trade and democratic political ideals.

During the years in which China has had MFN status, the volume of trade between China and the United States has been substantial. Some of the most important markets in China for United States exporters include grain, machine tools, aeronautics, and high technology products. More than 1,000 American companies have committed over \$4 billion to long term, United States-Chinese joint ventures. Revoking MFN status would jeopardize this investment.

Trade is crucial to the development of China as well. It not only provides

China with an important source of hard currency, but, more importantly, it provides a vehicle for the influx of Western ideas and values, as well as a medium by which our Government can continue to be an impetus for reform. If we revoke most-favored-nation status, we significantly weaken our bargaining position with the central government. While present conditions in China indicate that our influence has been somewhat ineffective, one must also consider the type of society with which our Government must negotiate. Ideology and trading practices in China are characteristic of a society completely foreign to our own. Change must be instituted with care. Revoking MFN status is not the most effective means of doing so.

Our goal should be to help to reform China so that it evolves into a society that shares our respect for human rights, democratic principles, and market-oriented economics. Revoking MFN would not severely wound the repressive central authority, but rather those attempting to push for reform. Southeast China is home to the most progressive political thinkers in the country. It is also the most entrepreneurial area in China. This is not just a coincidence.

We can be successful in achieving our goal by renewing MFN status but attaching to it certain tough, but fair, conditions. For this reason, I support H.R. 2212, introduced by my friend and colleague Congresswoman PELOSI. This bill allows the United States to maintain its trading status with China while at the same time it acts as a force for change. If the conditions of the Pelosi bill are not met by the Chinese Government, MFN status will not be renewed next year.

I believe that this is the best decision that can be made given the complex nature of this controversy. MFN status can be an effective tool if used correctly. Revoking MFN outright in this situation is clearly inappropriate.

□ 1830

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations and appreciation to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] for their outstanding leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2212, legislation that would make MFN status for China in 1992 conditional upon significant progress toward human rights goals, and would bring our country closer to the goal of one standard for human rights in the world.

China might finally get it, if we denied MFN status altogether. However, given the low human rights standards



of the Bush administration, the Congress now needs super majorities to ensure passage of human rights legislation. Facing this reality, I believe that making MFN status conditional upon human rights improvements is the most viable option.

Mr. Speaker, many countries, such as the Sudan, Romania, and Chile, have been denied trading preferences for violating precisely those workers' rights that MFN status would give China.

Why should China be rewarded? Is it like the megabanks, too big to fail? Where is the elusive single standard for human rights?

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be the only Member of Congress to participate in a press conference yesterday at the release by Amnesty International of the Amnesty International Report, 1991. This very highly respected annual report indicates that thousands of pro-democracy protesters arrested last year are still detained, without ever being tried or charged.

Amnesty International also recorded 750 firing squad executions, which represented the highest number since 1983. In China, those who did not conform to the politically correct religion are subject to detainment, harassment, and arrest.

The Bush Administration perpetuated these problems by renewing China's MFN status only 14 days after the Chinese Government implemented martial law in 1989. We were told at the time that MFN trade status was the 'key to our eventual hopes for a more democratic China.' Today, the evidence is that MFN has encouraged the oppressive human rights status quo. In fact, the policy has been another failure in a long line of attempts to promote democracy by granting MFN status in advance of reforms. Granting of MFN status to Romania, Poland, and the Soviet Union resulted in increased government repression which retarded the reform process. Poland finally reformed when we withdrew MFN status and the Communist Government had no choice but to negotiate with Solidarity. Let this experience finally be our guide. Unrestricted MFN status for China is undeserved, unwarranted, and unwise.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Pelosi bill. Last year I supported the legislation of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], which would have imposed conditions on the extension of China's most-favored-nation trade status for 1991. I felt that some conditions should be applied, so that the Chinese Government might attempt to reform its policies toward human rights in order to keep its MFN status with the United States.

Although I strongly support many of the goals included in H.R. 2212, I intend

to vote against this bill because I am concerned about what I consider a backdoor approach to actually revoking MFN status with China.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns of many Members that H.R. 2212 imposes much more stringent restrictions than last year's legislation would have enacted. I am concerned that H.R. 2212 would seriously harm United States businesses that have invested in China, and put at risk over \$5 billion in United States exports to China, a gap that Europe and Japan will surely fill.

Mr. Speaker, our greatest industry, our other manufacturers which now export to China or in some way benefit from imports from there, our American workers, would indeed lose through the elimination of MFN for China. Japan and Europe will be the gainers.

Even more importantly, I fear that H.R. 2212 will hurt the Chinese people more than the current leadership, because it will sever all links that enhance their well-being through jobs and support for human rights.

However, while I will vote against this bill today, I intend to closely watch China's progress on human rights reform. If I am not satisfied that the Chinese Government has made significant improvements in its policies, then I will not support the extension of MFN next year.

Leaders of China, heed the vote today on Solomon, heed the concern of the American people regarding your human rights and other policies addressed by this legislation. Change your thinking, or in the final analysis, you and your people, particularly your people, shall be ultimately the losers.

However, today, let us not yet sever our relationship, which affords us the opportunity, and hopefully, influence, to help our American workers, along with the little people of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ERDREICH].

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, last November I had the opportunity to make a private trip to mainland China, and I would like to share my perspective as we debate whether to extend China's most-favored-nation status. During my visit, I had the chance to meet with people from all walks of life, from farmers to teachers to individual storekeepers to government officials to students. One cannot visit China without being amazed by its size, its immense population, and, unfortunately, an overwhelming government rigidity that is a dark contrast to the freedoms we enjoy under the banner of democracy.

There is no question that many in China are striving for and working toward economic reform. I saw many examples of individual entrepreneurship, and there is no question that the future China will be a major trading nation, with worldwide exports. But today China is basically a controlled economy with an authoritarian political system. Why should we extend

favorable trade status to a Communist nation that puts many businesses and industries in my home county of Jefferson in direct competition with a country that pays its workers 37 cents an hour?

Current law forbids Communist countries from receiving trading benefits, and allows it only if the President annually requests this benefit. There are numerous reasons not to waive the clear mandate of current law . . . from China's brutal crackdown on peaceful pro-democracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square to its apparent abandonment of its program of democratic reform to its refusal to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (the only major nuclear power to refuse) to its shipment of sophisticated weapons around the world and to Iraq.

China has rapidly developed a favorite trade balance with the United States; today it is over \$10 billion and climbing. Certainly we should not provide favored nation status to this Communist nation at this time and should not support any presidential waiver of current law until conditions are dramatically improved for the people of China.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to join my colleagues in support of H.R. 2212.

Most-favored-nation status is a means for the United States to express its support for another nation and to encourage that nation to continue the policies of the past.

When we opened the door to China in 1980, we expected the People's Republic to move toward democracy and to move toward improving the lives of its citizens. For a while this policy worked and China opened its arms to the West. But since the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989, the Chinese have used MFN and our accommodation to manipulate our markets and hurt our economy.

Our trade deficit with China last year was more than \$10.4 billion. Our trade deficit for the first quarter of this year is over \$2.2 billion. Our trade deficit with China since the Tiananmen Square massacre has totaled over \$18.6 billion. It is obvious that the Chinese Government is attempting to bankroll its repressive regime and compile huge reserves of foreign currency. To maintain a favorable trade surplus, the Chinese Government has used compulsory prison labor to produce goods for export and has manipulated the market to keep their prices unrealistically low. In many cases, Chinese goods are being sold at prices less than the raw materials it took to make them.

By offering MFN to China in 1980, the United States graciously extended a hand to China and offered to help them move into the democratic world. The People's Republic of China have twisted this hand and are using our goodwill to bolster their repressive regime and as a tacit endorsement of their status quo. We must send a message today

that we will no longer turn our backs to the cries of those oppressed and will no longer be manipulated by our trading partners.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Pelosi bill and urge Members to do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, Members know of my longstanding friendship and affection for the Dalai Lama of Tibet and the people of Tibet and what they have been through under the occupation and the oppression of the Chinese.

The Dalai Lama himself told me in one of his visits to this country several years ago that he had talked to people who had been beaten in Lhasa, the former capital of Tibet, with boards that had nails driven through them. They were pounded and pounded until they confessed to whatever it was the Chinese had in mind. Those stories are legion and I do not need to recount them.

□ 1840

But one thing one of my colleagues said earlier this evening was that the Pelosi bill is the wrong way to deal with the Chinese, that they will do exactly the opposite of what we tell them to do. That reminded me of a story.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Pelosi proposal. I do so despite the regret I expressed earlier that the Rules Committee did not make in order my amendment that would have called on American business to follow a code of conduct in China similar to the Sullivan principles. It prevents political harassment on the premises of American businesses and stops buying of forced labor goods. I think such a code of conduct would have been very helpful in making American business a partner in the struggle for human rights in China. I hope at a future time the House will get to vote on that measure, as it did last term.

Nonetheless, on the issue before us I think the gentlewoman from California has come up with a principled, balanced approach. My distinguished colleague from Iowa said look at the history of China. I look at the history and I come up with a different answer than he does. I look at the history of the last year or two with unconditioned most-favored-nation trade status. Has it produced any change in the condition of prisoners in China? Has it produced any change in the jamming of the Voice of America? Has it produced any change in the harassment of Chinese students on American soil? The answer is no.

That calls for a different approach, which is what we have before us. It is

an approach that uses incentives, uses leverage. If it does not work, we can go to revocation, we can even go back to unconditional extension.

Some of my colleagues have said let us be realistic, let us show realism about our economic interests. I am for being realistic. But there is nothing wrong with having a moral element in our foreign policy. Taking a principled stand here will not only help enhance our status as a leader in the free world, it will help our realistic economic interests in the long run.

Believe me, a China that is repressive and totalitarian 5 or 10 years down the road is not going to be a good partner for American business. A China that we help move toward better treatment of human rights will be a far better business partner.

I urge support of the Pelosi bill.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 2212 and a strong supporter of forceful action on our part to bring an end to human rights abuses in the People's Republic of China, I rise to urge my colleagues to approve this legislation.

We simply cannot ignore the atrocious human rights record of the Chinese Government; it would be totally inappropriate to grant China preferential trading benefits with the United States. Since President Bush extended MFN for China last year, the human rights situation has not improved. By the Chinese regime's own estimates, over 270 prodemocracy demonstrators remain imprisoned without trial. It is perfectly clear that the administration's favorable policy toward China has not been successful, and that we must hold the Chinese Government accountable for its actions, in a very direct and forceful way.

While democracy and freedom are sweeping the world, the Chinese dictatorship keeps the Chinese and Tibetan people under Communist rule without any pretense of justice or basic freedoms. The status of the United States as the world's preeminent leader of democracy must not be compromised through appeasement or acquiescence to the Chinese regime. From the bloody massacre of the pro-democracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square to the current barbarous treatment of political prisoners and dissidents, the brutal Chinese regime has distinguished itself as a human rights abuser on a monumental scale.

China has also sold highly advanced weaponry to unstable governments such as those in Iran, Iraq, and Algeria. Many of these nations have a declared intention of building nuclear weapons. If we are to control the spread of weapons of mass destruction in a meaningful way, we must show China that we will not tolerate its unwise, wide-open pursuit of arms sales.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I believe that the conditions it imposes on granting MFN for China next year are totally appropriate. These conditions have to do with basic human rights that all governments should respect. There is no reason to allow China the benefits of MFN without a dramatic improvement in their despicable human rights record. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Pelosi bill, H.R. 2212, which places conditions on the renewal of most-favored-nation [MFN] status for the People's Republic of China [PRC]. The bill would require that China make "significant progress" in the area of human rights before receiving MFN status next year.

In March, CHRIS SMITH and I travelled to the PRC. We went to discuss a variety of human rights issues with Chinese leaders, including religious freedom. We presented Chinese Premier Li Peng with a letter signed by over 100 of our colleagues along with a list of 77 Catholic and Protestant bishops, ministers, and lay people who were in prison or under house arrest.

We have since learned that several of these prisoners were released before we left for China. However, only one has been freed since then. Unfortunately, the Chinese Government has demonstrated that it is continuing its policy of religious persecution by arresting Bishop Joseph Fan Zhongliang of Shanghai in June. Just when we are looking for China to take one step forward, they take one step backward.

In addition, Chinese authorities continue to hold democracy activists such as Wei Jingsheng and Wang Juntao in prison. As late as April of this year, two human rights activists were arrested for advocating further reform. The Chinese Government is choosing to rebuff international pressure regarding human rights reform and continuing to imprison people because of their political beliefs.

The Chinese Government is also refusing to allow thousands of its citizens to join relatives in other countries, including the spouses of several dissidents in the United States.

Regarding trade, the picture is no better. The CIA recently reported that China is continuing to put up import barriers. At the same time China is trying to avoid United States import quotas by transshipping goods through places such as Hong Kong and Macao. On top of that, we know that throughout much of the 1980's, the Chinese Government approved the use of prison labor to make goods for export.

During our trip to the PRC, CHRIS SMITH and I visited Beijing Prison No. 1 and saw prisoners making socks and plastic shoes. Since that trip we have



obtained evidence from Asia Watch which indicates that as late as October 1988, the Beijing municipal prisons, including the prison we visited, were making socks for export despite Chinese statements to the contrary.

In addition to human rights abuses and unfair trade practices, China is continuing to sell nuclear technology and nuclear-capable missiles to states such as Pakistan, Syria, Algeria, and now Iran, and all this despite American diplomatic pressure and technology sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, I keep looking for the Chinese Government to make positive changes in these areas, but instead of seeing progress, it almost seems as though China's leaders are intent on pushing America's patience to the limit. It is almost as though someone has written the Chinese Government a plan to ruin their chances of getting MFN, and they are following that plan carefully.

The Congress of the United States has an opportunity today to help the Chinese people. We must take a strong stand in support of attaching conditions to China's MFN status. The Chinese people want American trade, but they also want the freedom to enjoy basic human rights. I believe that the Pelosi bill is the best way to help the Chinese people have both.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, first let me commend the gentlewoman from California for the vigor and the effort that she has put into this very important issue that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, the renewal of China's most-favored-nation [MFN] status is a serious question in light of China's poor human rights record.

Also in question is the confusing signal the administration is putting out on their own human rights efforts around the world. While human rights and democratization programs are a high priority for emerging African nations, we close our eyes to the aspirations of the young people in China and erected the Statue of Liberty in Tiananmen Square.

The President opposes the \$20 million we voted for the U.N. Population Fund to continue their family planning programs around the world because of reports of forced abortions in China. Yet, the human rights of thousands of women in other countries will suffer.

And what about workers rights? While the administration proposes a free-market economy around the world, Chinese workers are denied basic freedoms and the right to join unions of their choosing. Many of these workers are in prison where they are making garment and other wearing apparel under slave-labor conditions. These very garments along with other

low-wage apparel imports are wiping out thousands of U.S. jobs.

At the same time many of these same garments are transhipped through other countries such as Macao, thereby violating the terms of our bilateral textile trade agreement with China.

Our country's failure to continue MFN status without conditions would send a signal to other freedom-loving countries that the United States condones trade agreement violations, and just does not care how China treats its citizens.

My 10th District of New Jersey, including Newark, has many working people, with high unemployment. Inexpensive Chinese shoes are flooding our market.

But no worker would stand proud in those same shoes knowing the cost in human sacrifice and human rights violations that makes their production possible.

That is why the only right thing to do is to put conditions on extending MFN status to help our people, and help the people of China.

□ 1850

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment and the accompanying bill give us the opportunity to have an ideal marriage between practicality and principle.

All of the arguments have been made. This debate is drawing to a close. What is not drawing to a close is the agony of the Chinese people.

Anybody who has gone through it with the students who have had to come to the United States, the students who were here at the time of Tiananmen Square, will never forget it.

This is our opportunity to make sure that the Chinese understand in the political world and that we in the United States understand in our political world that it is decisions in the political realm that drive the social and economic forces in China and not vice versa, and in order to accomplish that, human rights is fundamental. It is basic to seeing that the political decision is made. It is imperative that we pass this bill. It is imperative that we send this message to China.

In the process, we will find, as Americans, that we are standing up for principle, that we are standing up for human rights, that we are standing up for the people of China and for the workers in the United States.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, as someone who spent a lot of years dealing with foreign trade particularly in the Pacific rim countries before coming to Congress, I would like to offer maybe a little different perspective,

one that is not politically motivated, but I hope is anchored in reason and common sense.

I think what we are after is the correct goal, but unfortunately we are using the wrong tools to get where we want to be. What did Richard Nixon and what did Jimmy Carter teach the Soviet Union by putting trade and economic sanctions against them? What did we teach Saddam Hussein by putting economic sanctions against him? We lost markets for American products, American factory workers, and American farmers.

The old hardliners in China are in their eighties, and the good Lord is going to take care of them in a very short time. The new movement that is coming on in China, the Mayor of Shanghai, the Governor of Kwangtung Province, and so on realize that for communism in China to survive they have got to infuse a bit of capitalism to make it work.

For those in this body who are upset with what the Japanese have done to us, watch out what happens when China takes hold in the world of trade. I am concerned about human rights for the Chinese people, but I put more concern over the human rights of American farmers and American factory workers who will be put out of business and put out of jobs as we lose another trading partner and give it to the other nations of the world.

I do not think that \$5 billion worth of trade each year is something we should slough off because we disagree with what someone does. Let us do things that affect the Chinese Government, not the Chinese people. Take the help that we give them in their family-planning programs and some of those kinds of things which foster and promote their Communist form of government, but do not take food out of the mouths of the Chinese people and out of the American farmers' and the American factory workers' hands.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose most-favored-nation (MFN) status for China. It is neither in the best interests of China—and by that, I mean its people, not its rulers—nor in the best interests of the United States.

Only Congress has the power to stop the President from extending MFN status to China, and I hope we will do so.

I oppose MFN status for China for three reasons.

First, human rights. I think we should apply sanctions to let the People's Republic of China (PRC) know they must pay dearly for treating their people so oppressively.

Two years ago, the Governors of China ordered no less than a massacre of students demonstrating for democracy. Since Tiananmen Square, the Chinese Government has continued to

punish Chinese citizens who express anything short of wholehearted support for their Government. Thousands of Chinese have been jailed; numerous dissidents have been executed. Last year, when MFN for China was being debated, President Bush argued that through trade, we could persuade. According to this argument, MFN gives the United States leverage and influence with the Chinese Government. I have not seen the results. While bilateral trade has increased, China's human rights record has not improved.

I also oppose MFN because in trade as in human rights the Chinese have not reciprocated. China accounts for the second-largest share of the United States trade deficit; it is the largest exporter of textiles and apparel to the United States. Our country now runs a \$10 billion trade deficit with the PRC, and that deficit is projected to increase. Of the \$10 billion total deficit, \$3.68 billion comes from the deficit in textiles and apparel trade. Almost 14 percent of our total textile and apparel imports, or 1.7 billion square meters equivalent, come from the PRC. This deficit represents thousands of American jobs lost. What can I tell the unemployed textile worker in South Carolina that we have gained in return for his loss? Certainly not an ally or friend we respect in light of the way the Chinese treat their people; and certainly not a fair trading partner in light of growing trade deficit.

In fact, the U.S. Customs Service estimates that more than \$2 billion worth of Chinese textiles and apparel came to the United States by fraudulent means in 1990. Why should we reward such a trading partner with MFN status?

Finally, I oppose MFN also because of China's persistent policy of selling nuclear materials and nuclear technology to non-nuclear nations. China is the only major nuclear power in the world that is not a party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty; and not only have they not signed it, they have willfully ignored its purposes. There is ample evidence that the PRC has helped nations such as South Africa, India, Pakistan, and Brazil develop nuclear weapons.

I know so many countries enjoy MFN status that it means a lot less than the name implies. But I take the name literally; I am opposed to saying that a nation like China, guilty of abuses we all acknowledge, should be called a "most-favored" nation. So, I urge support for both House Joint Res. 263, which would withdraw China's MFN status, and for H.R. 2212, imposing conditions on extension of MFN status to China. I would prefer to see enactment of House Joint Res. 263, a flat MFN withdrawal over H.R. 2212, a conditioned withdrawal. However, the President has pledged to veto both bills when they reach his desk, and I believe

Congress has a better chance of overriding a veto of H.R. 2212. Therefore, I urge strong support for H.R. 2212.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the administration's policy is the modern-day equivalent of appeasement.

The Chinese continue to imprison their own citizens. They continue to sell dangerous weaponry around the world, and the United States steps forward to choose this nation at this time to continue MFN. If we have ever seen a case where a nation has slid back in the direction it chose it is China. China does not deserve MFN.

The policy of appeasement failed with Saddam Hussein. This administration maintained the policy until August 2 of protecting Saddam Hussein and assisting his Government. Appeasement has not worked in the past, and it is not going to work, not with the octogenarians in control of China today, nor with those who will follow them with the same policies unless America stands up for the men and women who suffered in Tiananmen Square.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, my Wisconsin congressional district is home to one of the largest Chinese student populations in America. During the crackdown on peaceful protestors in Tiananmen Square those Chinese students at the University of Wisconsin watched the Government terrorize their family and friends who had gathered to promote change and progress. When the Chinese students marched in this country they always feared Chinese Government spies would report the students' support for democracy back home putting their academic careers and their families in jeopardy. In the months that followed that crackdown they agonized over the fate of the protestors at Tiananmen Square and the uncertainty of their own future.

Today, Congress has its chance to promote change and progress in China and I support H.R. 2212 as the best way to do that. H.R. 2212 extends to the Government of China the benefits of most-favored-nation trade status as well as sending the unmistakable message that the United States expects reform in return.

This legislation calls for an accounting of the political prisoners being held because of their activity associated with the protest at Tiananmen Square and ultimately their release. This and other human rights provisions of the bill should have been demanded of the Chinese Government 2 years ago and we should do so today if China expects to do business with the United States.

It is obvious that very serious problems exist in China and we must at-

tempt to find solutions. The Chinese students and their friends and colleagues in my district are calling on us to help them change their country. A conditional renewal of MFN provides the means and the incentives for progress in the policies of the Chinese Government.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

□ 1900

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for this excellent piece of legislation.

I heard a colleague of mine say a few minutes ago that while there were good people on both sides of this debate, and there are good arguments on both sides of this debate, while I agree there are good people on both sides of the debate, I do not agree that there are good arguments on both sides of the debate.

A short time ago, some brave young men and women in China stood up for the things that this country has always stood for, for freedom, for democracy, and they put up a statue of the Statue of Liberty in Tiananmen Square. Now we are being asked to turn our backs on what they fought for, in order to be able to sell a few more products.

Let me tell Members, there is nothing in the Pelosi language that will stop trade with Communist China. It does not stop imports. It does not stop exports. It merely says that we will not give China the extra lower tariff, special treatment, that we reserve for our best friends. How any Member in this Chamber can argue that they are our best friend is beyond me.

I compliment again the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI]. I hope all of my colleagues will vote for this bill. I think they should have voted for the Solomon bill, as I did, but I certainly hope that the House will give a resounding vote to the Pelosi language.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining 2½ minutes.

This has been an excellent debate. I think good arguments have been made on both sides. There is no way for any one Member here today to predict with a certainty, with an absolute certainty, which approach is the best. We all want the same goals.

I would clarify one point. Speakers have said MFN is the lowest tariff, it is the best treatment we give only to our best friends. That is not true. Mr. Speaker, we have much lower tariffs for others, below MFN. Some of them are called GSP. Some of them are called free-trade agreements with no tariffs such as we have between Canada, and with Israel. To say that MFN is the best tariff treatment we give to any one country is not accurate.

Let me say that in my judgment, and I have a great deal of confidence in our



President who has as strong a desire for human rights as any Member in this body, but who has more expertise and knowledge on China than anyone in this body, who believes that the best approach is to leave some flexibility of negotiation, not to have rigid conditions that actually cannot even be determined whether they have been fully met or not, that will slam the door automatically in the face of an opportunity to continue to have dialog and engagement with the Chinese. I happen to believe that is the best approach.

I will be offering a motion to recommit which will incorporate many of the desired goals that we have talked about today in the debate. However, it will do it on a basis of giving the President the responsibility of reporting back, so that we will have that information for our decision next year, but it will not automatically slam the door on dialog engagement, an opportunity for leverage with the Chinese.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time, to close debate on this side, to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who has done a very good job of orchestrating not only the debate, but getting accolades from both sides of the aisle, a gentle person who has worked very hard on this.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the chairman for his support and assistance on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House spent a day debating how we can use our leverage to improve on trade, to improve human rights in China. We took this time because this issue is not only important to the people of China, but more importantly, because it is important to the people of the United States.

It is important for at least three reasons: For strategic reasons, because of China's participation in the proliferation of nuclear weapons; for economic reasons, because of the impediment to our trade into China, and the implications that that has on American jobs and on American workers; and on another reason of principle, because we, in passing this bill, will be living up to the principles of our democracy and the promise we extend to other countries when we broadcast on Voice of America a message of democracy.

I thank my colleagues for the excellent level of debate and their attention to this issue. I believe that this is a bill that the House wants, that is an optimistic bill. I am hopeful that the bill will pass and become law. I am hopeful that the prisoners will be freed. I am hopeful that democratic reform, which is inconceivable to the authorities in Beijing now, will be inevitable to the young people who demonstrated there. I am hopeful that most-favored-nation status for China can be renewed next year with pride instead of with shame.

Mr. Speaker, I want to in closing thank the staff of the Committee on

Ways and Means for their assistance in this matter, and recognize Craig Middleton of my staff for his assistance, and again thank all our colleagues.

I would like to take half a moment to thank my constituents in my district because many of them depend very heavily on trade from China. Many of them are from China. They would like to see most-favored-nation status continued. However, they are Americans now, and they know that their economic success that they have gained in this country cannot be gained on the backs of prison laborers and on the backs of those who deprive people of the right of freedom of speech, religion, or press. They are Americans now. This is an American response. I think it is sensitive to Chinese concerns.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 2212.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Under the rule, the previous question is considered as ordered on the committee amendment and on the bill.

The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. ARCHER

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the bill?

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARCHER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2212, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment: strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof—

#### SECTION 1. ACTIONS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS.

If the President proposes that the waiver authority granted by subsection (c) of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974 be extended in 1992 for a 12-month period with respect to the People's Republic of China, then the President shall include as a part of the document required to be submitted under subsection (d) of such section—

(1) a detailed statement regarding whether the government of that country has made significant progress in—

(A) reversing the pattern, dating from June 3, 1989, within the People's Republic of China of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights,

(B) providing an accounting for those citizens who were detained, accused, sentenced or imprisoned as a result of the nonviolent expression of their political beliefs during the violent repression of dissent in

Tiananmen Square on June 3, 1989, including whether such individual has been, or will soon be, released from custody,

(C) terminating religious persecution in the People's Republic of China, including intimidation or imprisonment of individuals for expression of their religious beliefs,

(D) removing the restrictions in the People's Republic of China on freedom of the press and on broadcasts by the Voice of America,

(E) terminating the acts of intimidation and harassment of Chinese citizens in the United States,

(F) ensuring freedom from torture and from inhumane prison conditions,

(G) terminating the prohibitions, imposed after June 3, 1989, on peaceful assembly and demonstration,

(H) ensuring the access of international human rights monitoring groups to prisoners, trials, and places of detention,

(I) prohibiting the use of forced labor, especially in the production of exports, and

(J) taking other appropriate action to promote substantial improvement in the observance of internationally recognized human rights in the People's Republic of China and greater opportunities for freedom and democracy in that country; and

(2) a statement on that government's population control policies, including any program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

#### SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL FACTORS REGARDING THE EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT OF CHINA IN 1992.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In deciding whether or not to recommend in 1992 the extension of the waiver authority referred to in section 1 with respect to the People's Republic of China, the President shall also take into account—

(1) the potential economic and political effects that such an extension, or the absence of such an extension, may have on Hong Kong;

(2) whether the government of the People's Republic of China is adhering to the Joint Declaration on Hong Kong that was entered into between the United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China; and

(3) the extent to which the government of the People's Republic of China has moderated its position regarding the accession of Taiwan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

(b) REPORT.—Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report describing the status of Taiwan's application for accession to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The President shall thereafter regularly consult with Congress regarding the support which the United States is extending to such application.

#### SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL INTERIM MEASURES IF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT EXTENDED TO CHINA IN 1991.

If nondiscriminatory treatment is extended in 1991 to the People's Republic of China under section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974, the President shall consider whether the taking of additional measures is necessary or appropriate during the effective period of the extension to address bilateral trade disputes or to ensure continued progress within that country toward human rights. Such measures may include—

(1) in response to unfair trade practices, action by the United States Trade Representative—

(A) in initiating additional cases under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 in re-

sponse to practices such as licensing procedures that serve as trade barriers, quotas or other import restrictions, and discriminatory testing and certification practices; and

(B) promptly seeking remedies provided under the trade laws if the People's Republic of China fails to correct unjustifiable, unreasonable, or discriminatory trade practices;

(2) aggressive and prompt action under the appropriate trade laws to ensure that the People's Republic of China provide adequate protection to intellectual property rights; and

(3) in response to violations of human rights, the strict conditioning of United States support for international loans to the People's Republic of China on improvement by the government of that country in protecting and guaranteeing such rights.

#### SEC. 4. RELATED UNITED STATES-CHINA TRADE MATTERS.

The following actions shall be taken during each 12-month period in which non-discriminatory treatment is extended to the People's Republic of China under section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974:

(1) **TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLE QUOTA VIOLATIONS.**—The Commission of Customs, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall—

(A) determine whether any textile or apparel article that is—

(i) a product of the People's Republic of China, and

(ii) subject to quantitative restrictions under a bilateral agreement between that country and the United States, is being transhipped through a third country for purposes of avoiding such restrictions;

(B) if any transshipment described in subparagraph (A) is found, charge against the quota of People's Republic of China for such kind of textile or apparel article twice the volume of the goods involved in such transshipment; and

(C) within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, but no later than July 3, 1992, report to the Congress regarding all determinations and charges against quotas made under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(2) **FORCED LABOR PRODUCTS.**—The Commissioner of Customs, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall establish a system for investigating allegations that a product or component was produced by forced labor in the People's Republic of China and is being imported into the United States. Such system shall provide for—

(A) an office to which information about such imports can be submitted or requested by interested parties; and

(B) procedures for the initiation of investigations upon petition by interested parties, the timely conclusion of such investigations, and determining what action should be taken to stop the importation of such products or components.

The Commissioner of Customs shall submit an annual report to Congress regarding the efforts by the government of the People's Republic of China to terminate exports of products made by forced labor to the United States and the status and nature of investigations undertaken pursuant to this paragraph.

#### SEC. 5. REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT ON EFFECTS OF ACTIONS ON UNITED STATES EXPORTS.

In deciding whether or not to recommend the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the People's Republic of China in 1992, the President shall evaluate the effects

of such action on major United States exports, including agricultural exports. The results of such evaluation shall be included in the report required under section 402(d) of the Trade Act of 1974.

#### SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) **CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) cooperation between the governments of the United States and the People's Republic of China on international issues of common concern is one basis, among several, for the positive development of United States-China relations;

(2) the United States and China have cooperated productively to bring about the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan;

(3) Chinese initiatives vis-a-vis North Korea have contributed to enhanced stability on the Korean peninsula and the security of South Korea;

(4) China and the United States, along with Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union have developed a formula for a comprehensive political settlement of the Cambodian conflict which holds out the promise of freedom, independence, and self-determination for the Cambodian people;

(5) China supported, or did not obstruct, the efforts of the United States to forge an international coalition to oppose Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait;

(6) the Government of China has accepted President Bush's invitation to take part in a conference of major arms suppliers to discuss future weapons transfers to Middle East nations;

(7) on the other hand, China's continued support for the Khmer Rouge has the potential of undermining the prospects for a peaceful resolution of the Cambodian conflict;

(8) China's reported intention to sell to Syria intermediate range ballistic missiles which fall within the limits of the Missile Technology Control Regime threatens to destabilize the military balance in the Middle East and to threaten the security of Israel;

(9) China's reported intention to sell to Pakistan intermediate range ballistic missiles which fall within the limits of the Missile Technology Control Regime threatens to destabilize the military balance in the South Asian region and to increase the prospects of unconventional military conflict on the subcontinent; and

(10) China's reported 1983 sale of an unsafeguarded nuclear power reactor to Algeria calls into question China's subsequent commitments to act in accordance with the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—In view of the findings set forth in subsection (a)—

(1) it is the sense of Congress that foreign policy actions by the Government of the People's Republic of China which undermine United States global interests and which are inconsistent with past cooperation between the United States and China (such as the transfer of missile covered by the Missile Technology Control Regime and transfers of unsafeguarded nuclear equipment, materials, and technology) will have serious negative consequences for the development of United States-China relations, in particular placing in jeopardy the access of Chinese products to the United States market through non-discriminatory tariff status; and

(2) the Congress urges the Government of China to take constructive steps on a unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral basis to re-

duce tensions in regional military conflicts, particularly by—

(A) restricting the transfer of conventional weapons,

(B) working constructively toward the creation of a multilateral conventional arms transfer and control regime,

(C) agreeing not to transfer weapons of mass destruction, and

(D) agreeing to multilateral controls on the transfer of ballistic missiles and the technology associated with the development of such weapons and delivery systems.

Mr. ARCHER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 5 minutes and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit takes the form of a substitute for the bill. I believe my approach, which drew strong bipartisan support in the committee, provides a more realistic course of action for the United States.

The substitute formulates a new basis for Congress to determine whether China's behavior on human rights and trade matters justifies support for the President's decision on MFN in 1992.

It says we will not conduct "business as usual" with China—we will not "close our eyes" to Tiananmen Square—but, I believe it is a more responsible approach that will allow the President and Congress together to apply pressure on the hardline leadership in China. Unlike H.R. 2212 as reported, the substitute addresses China's behavior not just with respect to human rights but also in the areas of unfair trade practices.

Under my substitute, if the President proposes to extend MFN for China beginning June 3, 1992, he must provide a detailed description of whether China has made significant progress on a list of human rights measures.

They include providing an accounting of those citizens detained and imprisoned, ending religious persecution, ensuring freedom of the press and allowing access to trials. The President must include in this detailed report a statement on China's population control policies, including any program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

This approach makes Congress and the President partners in assessing China's human rights and economic behavior, treating all human rights issues as having equal priority. It does not establish impossible certifications or rigid conditionality. It becomes part of the statutorily mandated report, just as under H.R. 2212.



The substitute further requires that the President consider the potential impact on Hong Kong of MFN removal, and states that the U.S. is to press for Taiwan's entry into the GATT as a separate customs union with developed country status.

One of the most important aspects of my substitute is that it deals with economic issues as well as human rights. China's trade practices have been very unsatisfactory over the last 2 years, and it is important that we increase the pressure for improvement in this area.

The substitute directs the President to consider further economic sanctions, including self-initiating additional 301 or other trade law cases and conditioning U.S. support for international loans.

The substitute also addresses the problem of Chinese transshipments of improperly identified textile and apparel products through Hong Kong. It requires Customs to charge double volume against China's quota for any violations. Customs must also establish procedures for investigating and stopping forced labor imports from China.

The substitute also recognizes the vulnerability of U.S. exports, particularly wheat, corn and other agriculture products. Before recommending any interim sanctions or further extensions of MFN, the President must evaluate and take into account the effects of any action on major U.S. exports.

Finally, the substitute incorporates the language of House Joint Resolution 174, introduced by Congressman SOLARZ, urging China to take constructive steps to ensure that weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons, and missile technology are not transferred to third countries.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my substitute is a superior approach to dealing with the current hard-line leadership in China. It attempts to maximize the pressure without hurting the Chinese people who have proven a love for freedom and democracy. My substitute allows the President and the Congress to work together toward a unified U.S. policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit with instructions.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's motion to recommit. The motion seeks to weaken an already very well-balanced bill. When this bill was put together with its 150 cosponsors, it was crafted with the full participation of the Congressional Working Group on China. We did this bill with an eye to renewing most-favored-nation status in 1992, crafting reasonable conditions that could be met.

The gentleman's motion abdicates the right of this body to exercise its will on taxation issues, which trades and tariffs are, abdicates that to the President of the United States.

I am certain, I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], that the President of the United States does take these issues into consideration when he considers renewal of most-favored-nation status for China. I do not expect that the President of the United States makes that decision in a vacuum; at least, I hope he has considered these issues, but this is simply not enough.

The present policy has not worked. The human rights conditions have worsened. The repression continues. The trade deficit grows. The nuclear proliferation continues. The export of prison labor goods continues and increases. The present policy, as I said, has not worked.

That is why I am so glad that in crafting this legislation, we have the support of so many of those who have a really vested interest in the continuation of most-favored-nation status for China next year.

The Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars, the Democracy for China, the Chinese Alliance for Democracy, Dr. Fang Lizhi, and the list goes on and on of dissidents and those who care about democracy in China, but who very much want most-favored-nation status to continue. They support this conditional approach.

What is important here today, Mr. Speaker, is to remember that when we put this bill together it was with the intention of getting the broadest base of support. We made concessions in the legislation in order to be able to have as united a front as possible, to send the clearest message possible to the authorities in Beijing that their trade relationship with us was one we wanted to continue, but we could not continue unless there was a change in their treatment of their people, and that the prisoners be released.

So I appeal to my colleagues to defeat the Archer motion to recommit and let us give one big vote today for H.R. 2212. Let the message be very clear and let us then proceed through the process with the best bill, with the broadest amount of support.

I think it is clear from the debate that this is legislation that the House wants. I am very proud of the bipartisan support that it has received.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit H.R. 2212. Although I believe that the substitute amendment set forth in the motion is a reasonable one, and one that I am philosophically inclined to support, I believe it is imperative that the House send a strong, united message to the Chinese Government that the status quo is no longer acceptable. We must see dramatic improvement in China's record on human rights if China is going to maintain its MFN status in the future. I will therefore vote against the motion to recommit and for H.R. 2212, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means. I will however, work in conference

to improve the bill so that, hopefully, it can be signed by the President.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 263, a resolution to disprove most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status for the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of this resolution, and I had intended to contribute to the debate on this important issue. However, I was unavoidably detained at a Ways and Means Committee hearing during House consideration of this resolution.

The People's Republic of China is a renegade nation and refuses to recognize the basic human rights of its citizens. It has been 2 years since the brutal massacre in Tiananmen Square, and the situation in China has remained the same.

The Chinese Government still suppresses political opposition, restricts the press, detains and incarcerates its citizens and uses prisoners for slave labor. Its brutal annexation and occupation of the sovereign nation of Tibet is a violation of that country's inalienable rights of self-determination and religious freedom.

Internationally, China is considered a major nuclear power and yet has repeatedly refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Recent evidence indicates that the Chinese Government has helped in the development of several nuclear weapons programs in Pakistan, India, Algeria, Brazil, Argentina, and South Africa.

Far from improving, China's treatment of its citizens and actions in the world community have deteriorated. The administration's desire to continue its policy of constructive engagement with the Chinese Government is appeasement in its worst form.

Extending the MFN status for China is not an economic issue, it is a matter of principle. We must immediately suspend MFN status. To extend MFN with conditions does not go far enough.

I am pleased that a majority of my colleagues agree with me about the need for the United States to send a clear and unequivocal message to the Chinese Government that its disregard for the rights of its citizens and its responsibilities as a member of the international community can no longer be tolerated. I would also like to take this opportunity to commend my colleague, Representative GERALD SOLOMON, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, "the cause of America is the cause of all mankind." Although penned over 200 years ago, Common Sense remains the most eloquent and inspiring defense of freedom ever written. People throughout the world continue to follow the standard set by Thomas Paine and his fellow American revolutionaries when seeking to shake the oppressive yoke of totalitarianism and establish democratic nations and representative governments.

Many examples can be given, but the most powerful in recent memory must be that of the Chinese students in Tiananmen Square defiantly hoisting a statue of Lady Liberty in protest of a violently oppressive Chinese Government. In a moment of singular clarity, the stance of an unarmed dissident challenging a menacing line of armored tanks came to rep-

resent the struggle of all oppressed individuals seeking freedom and affirmation of their belief that all men are created equal and endowed with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is at times like these that we must renew our commitment to the principles embodied in our Government and way of life. Our policies must reflect an abhorrence of totalitarianism and an unyielding defense of freedom. Whether political, economic, or moral, our force must be equal to the challenge. We cannot continue to act as if nothing has happened, as if the students' courageous demonstration was without merit and without effect. To do so is to mock these individuals and their cause, and by inference to besmirch the victory over tyranny of our forebears.

The President believes that extending most-favored-nation trade status to China will enable us to influence their policies. We have maintained this status since the events in Beijing in 1989, and the effect has been negligible. I have visited China, and while I was impressed by the importance the Chinese ascribed to the United States view of their economy, political system and culture, I was disappointed by the official disregard for the events in Tiananmen Square. The Government's brutal repression of the protest was shocking, and its characterization of the demonstration and subsequent retaliation as insignificant at the very least indicates a lack of understanding about human rights and the value Americans place on democratic ideals.

I cannot in good conscience support the status quo. It is true that, with one-fifth of the world's population, China cannot be isolated without serious consequences. It is for that reason that I oppose a total U.S. withdrawal. However, without specific conditions for a continued relationship, China will be free to continue massive oppression, unrestricted trade and nuclear proliferation. Only through the establishment of basic standards for a trade relationship will appropriate pressure be brought to bear upon the perpetrators of these abuses.

I am proud to join my colleagues in sending a clear message that our ideals and beliefs are timeless and powerful. By approving H.R. 2212, we will assure the Chinese people of our continued involvement in their struggle to obtain the fundamental freedoms of speech, action, and belief.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule

XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of final passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 118, nays 308, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

#### YEAS—118

Alexander	Hall (TX)	Packard
Allard	Hamilton	Paxon
Archer	Hammerschmidt	Petri
Armey	Hansen	Pickle
Baker	Hastert	Pursell
Ballenger	Hobson	Quillen
Barrett	Holloway	Regula
Bereuter	Houghton	Rhodes
Bilirakis	Hyde	Rinaldo
Boehner	Johnson (CT)	Roberts
Brooks	Johnson (SD)	Roe
Broomfield	Johnson (TX)	Roemer
Callahan	Johnston	Roth
Camp	Kolbe	Sarpalius
Campbell (CA)	Kopetski	Schaefer
Chandler	Laughlin	Scheuer
Clinger	Leach	Shaw
Coble	Lent	Shays
Coleman (MO)	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Combest	Lightfoot	Skelton
Coughlin	Livingston	Slaughter (VA)
Crane	Lowery (CA)	Smith (OR)
Dannemeyer	Lukens	Solarz
Davis	Machtley	Stenholm
DeLay	Marlenee	Stump
Dorman (CA)	Martin	Sundquist
Dreier	Matsui	Taylor (NC)
English	McCandless	Thomas (CA)
Ewing	McCrery	Thomas (WY)
Fawell	McDade	Vander Jagt
Fields	McMillan (NC)	Volkmer
Fish	Meyers	Vucanovich
Franks (CT)	Michel	Weber
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Williams
Geren	Montgomery	Wylie
Gilchrest	Morrison	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Myers	Young (FL)
Gradison	Nichols	Zimmer
Grandy	Nussle	
Guarini	Oxley	

#### NAYS—308

Abercrombie	Carr	Engel
Ackerman	Chapman	Erdreich
Anderson	Clay	Espy
Andrews (ME)	Clement	Evans
Andrews (NJ)	Coleman (TX)	Fascell
Andrews (TX)	Collins (IL)	Fazio
Annuzio	Collins (MI)	Feighan
Anthony	Condit	Flake
Applegate	Conyers	Foglietta
Aspin	Cooper	Ford (MI)
Atkins	Costello	Ford (TN)
AuCoin	Cox (CA)	Frank (MA)
Bacchus	Cox (IL)	Frost
Barnard	Coyne	Galleghy
Barton	Cramer	Gallo
Bateman	Cunningham	Gaydos
Beilenson	Darden	Gejdenson
Bennett	DeFazio	Gephardt
Bentley	DeLauro	Gibbons
Berman	Dellums	Gilman
Bevill	Derrick	Gingrich
Bilbray	Dickinson	Glickman
Bliley	Dicks	Gonzalez
Boehlert	Dingell	Goodling
Bonior	Dixon	Gordon
Borski	Donnelly	Goss
Boucher	Dooley	Gray
Boxer	Doolittle	Green
Brewster	Dorgan (ND)	Gunderson
Browder	Downey	Hall (OH)
Brown	Duncan	Hancock
Bruce	Durbin	Harris
Bryant	Dwyer	Hatcher
Bunning	Dymally	Hayes (IL)
Burton	Early	Hayes (LA)
Bustamante	Eckart	Hefley
Byron	Edwards (CA)	Hefner
Campbell (CO)	Edwards (OK)	Henry
Cardin	Edwards (TX)	Hergert
Carper	Emerson	

Hoagland	Mollohan	Saxton
Hochbrueckner	Moody	Schiff
Horn	Moorhead	Schroeder
Horton	Moran	Schulze
Hoyer	Morella	Schumer
Hubbard	Mrazek	Sensenbrenner
Huckaby	Murphy	Serrano
Hughes	Murtha	Sharp
Hutto	Nagle	Shuster
Ireland	Natcher	Sikorski
James	Neal (MA)	Sisisky
Jefferson	Neal (NC)	Skaggs
Jenkins	Nowak	Slattery
Jones (GA)	Oakar	Slaughter (NY)
Jones (NC)	Oberstar	Smith (FL)
Jontz	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Kanjorski	Olin	Smith (TX)
Kaptur	Oliver	Snowe
Kasich	Ortiz	Solomon
Kennedy	Orton	Spence
Kennelly	Owens (NY)	Spratt
Kildee	Owens (UT)	Staggers
Kleczka	Pallone	Stallings
Klug	Panetta	Stark
Kolter	Parker	Stearns
Kostmayer	Patterson	Stokes
Kyl	Payne (NJ)	Studds
LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Swett
Lagomarsino	Pease	Swift
Lancaster	Pelosi	Synar
Lantos	Penny	Tallon
LaRocco	Perkins	Tanner
Lehman (CA)	Peterson (FL)	Tauzin
Lehman (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Levin (MI)	Pickett	Thomas (GA)
Levine (CA)	Porter	Thornton
Lewis (FL)	Poshard	Torres
Lewis (GA)	Price	Torricelli
Lipinski	Rahall	Towns
Lloyd	Ramstad	Traficant
Long	Rangel	Traxler
Lowey (NY)	Ravenel	Unsoeld
Manton	Ray	Upton
Markey	Reed	Valentine
Martinez	Richardson	Vento
Mavroules	Ridge	Visclosky
Mazzoli	Riggs	Walker
McCloskey	Ritter	Walsh
McCollum	Rogers	Washington
McCurdy	Rohrabacher	Waters
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
McEwen	Rose	Weiss
McGrath	Rostenkowski	Weldon
McHugh	Roukema	Wheat
McMillen (MD)	Rowland	Wilson
McNulty	Roybal	Wise
Mfume	Russo	Wolf
Miller (CA)	Sabo	Wolpe
Miller (WA)	Sanders	Wyden
Mineta	Sangmeister	Yates
Mink	Santorium	Yatron
Moakley	Savage	Zeliff
Molinari	Sawyer	

#### NOT VOTING—7

de la Garza	Inhofe	Whitten
Hopkins	Jacobs	
Hunter	Smith (IA)	

□ 1936

Messrs. BLILEY, COOPER, WELDON, and DINGELL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GEREN of Texas, DANNE-MEYER, and ALEXANDER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 313, nays 112, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

#### YEAS—313

Abercrombie	Espy	McCollum
Ackerman	Evans	McCurdy
Andrews (ME)	Fascell	McDermott
Andrews (NJ)	Fazio	McEwen
Andrews (TX)	Feighan	McGrath
Annunzio	Fish	McHugh
Anthony	Flake	McMillan (NC)
Aspin	Foglietta	McMillen (MD)
Atkins	Ford (MI)	McNulty
Bacchus	Ford (TN)	Mfume
Ballenger	Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)
Barnard	Frost	Miller (WA)
Barton	Galleghy	Mineta
Beilenson	Gallo	Mink
Bennett	Gaydos	Moakley
Bentley	Gedjenson	Molinari
Berman	Gephardt	Mollohan
Bevill	Gibbons	Moody
Bilbray	Gilchrest	Moorhead
Boehlert	Gilman	Moran
Bonior	Gingrich	Morella
Borski	Gooding	Mrazek
Boucher	Gordon	Murphy
Boxer	Gray	Nagle
Brewster	Green	Neal (MA)
Brooks	Gunderson	Neal (NC)
Broomfield	Hall (OH)	Nowak
Browder	Hancock	Oakar
Bruce	Harris	Oberstar
Bryant	Hatcher	Obey
Bunning	Hayes (IL)	Olin
Burton	Hefley	Olver
Bustamante	Hefner	Ortiz
Byron	Henry	Orton
Campbell (CO)	Henger	Owens (NY)
Cardin	Hertel	Owens (UT)
Carper	Hobson	Pallone
Carr	Hochbrueckner	Panetta
Chapman	Horn	Parker
Clay	Horton	Patterson
Clement	Hoyer	Payne (NJ)
Coble	Hubbard	Payne (VA)
Coleman (TX)	Huckaby	Pease
Collins (IL)	Hughes	Pelosi
Collins (MI)	Hutto	Penny
Condit	Hyde	Perkins
Conyers	James	Peterson (FL)
Cooper	Jefferson	Pickle
Costello	Jenkins	Porter
Coughlin	Jones (GA)	Poshard
Cox (CA)	Jones (NC)	Price
Cox (IL)	Jontz	Pursell
Coyne	Kanjorski	Rahall
Cramer	Kaptur	Ramstad
Cunningham	Kasich	Rangel
Dannemeyer	Kennedy	Ravenel
Darden	Kennelly	Ray
DeFazio	Kildee	Reed
DeLauro	Kleczka	Regula
DeLay	Klug	Richardson
Dellums	Kolter	Ridge
Derrick	Kostmayer	Riggs
Dickinson	Kyl	Ritter
Dicks	LaFalce	Roe
Dingell	Lagomarsino	Rogers
Dixon	Lancaster	Rohrabacher
Donnelly	Lantos	Ros-Lehtinen
Dooley	LaRocco	Rose
Doolittle	Lehman (CA)	Rostenkowski
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (FL)	Roukema
Dornan (CA)	Levin (MI)	Rowland
Downey	Levine (CA)	Roybal
Duncan	Lewis (FL)	Russo
Durbin	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Dwyer	Lipinski	Sanders
Dymally	Lloyd	Sangmeister
Early	Long	Santorum
Eckart	Lowey (NY)	Savage
Edwards (CA)	Machtley	Sawyer
Edwards (OK)	Manton	Saxton
Edwards (TX)	Markey	Schaefer
Emerson	Martinez	Scheuer
Engel	Mavroules	Schiff
English	Mazzoli	Schroeder
Erdreich	McCloskey	Schulze

Schumer	Stallings	Vento
Sensenbrenner	Stark	Visclosky
Serrano	Stearns	Volkmmer
Sharp	Stokes	Walker
Shuster	Studds	Walsh
Sikorski	Sweet	Washington
Sisisky	Swift	Waters
Skaggs	Synar	Waxman
Skelton	Tallon	Weiss
Slattery	Tanner	Weldon
Slaughter (NY)	Taylor (NC)	Wheat
Smith (FL)	Thomas (GA)	Wilson
Smith (NJ)	Thornton	Wise
Smith (TX)	Torricelli	Wolf
Snowe	Towns	Wolpe
Solarz	Trafficant	Yates
Solomon	Traxler	Yatron
Spence	Unsoeld	Zeliff
Spratt	Upton	
Staggers	Valentine	

#### NAYS—112

Alexander	Hamilton	Nussle
Allard	Hammerschmidt	Oxley
Anderson	Hansen	Packard
Applegate	Hastert	Paxon
Archer	Hayes (LA)	Peterson (MN)
Armey	Hoagland	Petri
Baker	Holloway	Pickett
Barrett	Houghton	Quillen
Bateman	Ireland	Rhodes
Bereuter	Johnson (CT)	Rinaldo
Billirakis	Johnson (SD)	Roberts
Bliley	Johnson (TX)	Roemer
Boehner	Johnston	Roth
Brown	Kolbe	Sarpallus
Callahan	Kopetski	Shaw
Camp	Laughlin	Shays
Campbell (CA)	Leach	Skeen
Chandler	Lent	Slaughter (VA)
Clinger	Lewis (CA)	Smith (OR)
Coleman (MO)	Lightfoot	Stenholm
Combest	Livingston	Stump
Crane	Lowery (CA)	Sundquist
Davis	Luken	Tauzin
Dreier	Marlenee	Taylor (MS)
Ewing	Martin	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	Matsui	Thomas (WY)
Fields	McCandless	Torres
Franks (CT)	McCrery	Vander Jagt
Gekas	McDade	Vucanovich
Geren	Meyers	Weber
Gillmor	Michel	Williams
Glickman	Miller (OH)	Wyden
Gonzalez	Montgomery	Wylie
Goss	Morrison	Young (AK)
Gradison	Murtha	Young (FL)
Grandy	Myers	Zimmer
Guarini	Natcher	
Hall (TX)	Nichols	

#### NOT VOTING—8

AuCoin	Hunter	Smith (IA)
de la Garza	Inhofe	Whitten
Hopkins	Jacobs	

□ 1946

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hunter for, with Mr. Jacobs against.

Mr. GLICKMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the contents of House Concurrent Resolution 174 are embodied in the Pelosi amendment, I ask unanimous consent to lay House Concurrent Resolution 174 on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2282, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-147) on the resolution (H. Res. 190) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2282) to amend the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1988, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 656, PROVIDING FOR A PROGRAM TO ENSURE U.S. LEADERSHIP IN HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-148) on the resolution (H. RES 191) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 656) to provide for a coordinated Federal research program to ensure continued U.S. leadership in high-performance computing, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERING OF H.R. 1989, AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY PREEMINENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-149) on the resolution (H. Res. 192) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1989) to authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### NATIONAL FAMILY WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 23) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating each of the weeks beginning on November 24, 1991 and November 22, 1992, as National Family Week, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

□ 1950

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, today I

urge my colleagues to approve House Joint Resolution 23, which would authorize the President to designate the week beginning November 24, 1991, and November 22, 1992, as National Family Week.

This resolution encourages the States and local communities to observe the week and celebrate the family with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The purpose of National Family Week is to promote recognition of and appreciation for the American family as the foundation of our free society, and to lay before the American family the challenge to continue to perpetuate and preserve freedom, honor and trust among all people.

Honoring the family in the United States is a practice everyone can be proud of. I am pleased to state it was 20 years ago in 1971, when I first introduced this legislation and I have reintroduced it each Congress.

A family is more than a group of individuals—a family is a community of persons united by their commitment and love for one another.

I hope all my colleagues feel as strongly about the family as I do and will join me in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Indiana for yielding, and I pause at this point merely to commend him for this very special effort to recognize the importance of the American family. I only hope that whatever ails the arm of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] at this point is not the product of having twisted arms to get Members to sign on in time in order to have this recognition today.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for his remarks, as well as his help in bringing this to the floor today, and I appreciate the efforts of all members of the committee who went out of their way to make sure it is brought up each year. This is the earliest in recent years this bill has been brought up. I know it will get to the President for his signature very early, and it is important to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 23

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating each of the weeks beginning on November 24, 1991, and November 22, 1992, as "National Family Week".*

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was

read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL ELLIS ISLAND DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 130) to designate January 1 as National Ellis Island Day, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I certainly do not object, and do so to yield to the prime sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI].

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, January 1 of 1992 will mark the 100th anniversary of the opening of Ellis Island—a major gateway of immigration into this country. Since that first day in 1892, 12 million people from all over the world have passed through the doors of Ellis Island. The great American poet, Emma Lazarus described them as "tired, poor, huddled masses yearning to breathe free." During the heavy immigration of the early 1900's, their first view of America was the shining spires of New York city and the noble figure of the Statue of Liberty, however, their first steps on American soil were taken on Ellis Island.

Today, over 40 percent of Americans can trace their roots to an individual who passed through Ellis Island. Today, we know them as our grandfathers and grandmothers, our aunts and uncles, members of our families, who struggled and sacrificed to realize their dreams in this country. Some of them came to escape persecution, others came to escape poverty, but all came to forge a new life in a land of freedom and prosperity—the United States of America.

It is fitting, therefore, that Ellis Island now serves as a museum to tell the story of American immigration. The Ellis Island Immigration Museum was built through the efforts and private donations of over 20 million Americans. Since its opening last September, over half a million visitors have already toured through the facility, walking through the same halls in which their ancestors were processed years ago. Today on Ellis Island, present and future generations can learn about the history of their families and their Nation.

Today, we consider a resolution which I have introduced to commemorate January 1, 1992 as National Ellis Island Day—January 1 being the day the first immigrants set foot on Ellis

Island almost 100 years ago. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and in doing so recognize the anniversary of this important national landmark. Ellis Island is a symbol of the hope for freedom and prosperity which America offered to the world in the past and continues to offer today.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and the legislation he has presented here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this resolution, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 130, which designates January 1, as National Ellis Island Day, and commend my good friend and colleague from the state of New Jersey, Mr. GUARINI, for introducing this legislation for focusing attention on America's gateway.

Ellis Island symbolizes the hopes and dreams of over 12 millions of our Nation's immigrants. The island was the first contact they had with a land of new freedom, hope, and promise. This resolution serves as an appropriate tribute to a magnificent place in American history.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I urge our colleague to join in supporting this important resolution.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, and offer special gratitude to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI], for this important and timely resolution.

For those of us on our committee who have been struggling over the last year to bring the fullest possible count to the enumeration of our Nation, we can appreciate the recognition that the gentleman from New Jersey brings to Ellis Island today. It is a recognition of an age of transcontinental migration, a period in which the great waves of European migration a century ago surpassed 1 million a year, as this Nation grew and achieved the diversity that it benefits from today.

Mr. Speaker, we are today in another age of global migration, as populations in unprecedented numbers move around the globe and into this Nation in numbers unexperienced since that age of great immigration a century ago.

Mr. Speaker, as we struggle to cope with the challenge and the benefits of the diversity that comes to this Nation today, it is important to recognize and remember those lessons from the past that have made this Nation all that it is in the twentieth century. For that, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI], and all of those who



joined in this special recognition today.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for his comments, and thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and all who took part in introducing this legislation.

Ellis Island has touched just about everyone in this country. We had ancestors who came through there. Their first revelation, their first opportunity to see the New World, was Ellis Island. It is most appropriate that it has now been restored, and, more appropriately, we recognize the importance that Ellis Island has been to bring this great melting pot of the United States into reality.

Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate, and we thank these Members for the introduction of this legislation.

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I think I can say it certainly speaks to the great sense of what America is about, and expresses in its totality the American spirit. I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if we go to Ellis Island and look at the coldness of the big halls, you would say, "My gosh, our ancestors came in here. What a reception, to come into this cold building."

Mr. Speaker, many of these people did not speak English. They came into a new country, and were put into these cold halls. But how soon after that, I hope that they got out into what America really is, into the free world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity that we have to recognize our ancestors for what they brought to make America what it is today. It is most appropriate what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI] has done here today, again restoring Ellis Island as a national memorial.

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fitting for every American to make a commitment to themselves, that some day they will visit Ellis Island with their family.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it should be mandatory, to have everyone go visit there.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 130

Whereas the immigrant station at Ellis Island, New York, opened on January 1, 1892, admitting 700 immigrants to the United States on its 1st day of operation;

Whereas approximately 17,000,000 immigrants were admitted through Ellis Island between and 1892 and 1954;

Whereas Ellis Island was reopened in the fall of 1990 as a historic site of interest to tourists;

Whereas January 1, 1992, will mark the centennial of the opening of Ellis Island;

Whereas approximately 40 percent of all people of the United States today can trace their heritage to an immigrant ancestor who was admitted through Ellis Island;

Whereas Ellis Island is a reminder of the hope for freedom and prosperity that the United States offered to the poor, tired, hungry, and downtrodden of the world;

Whereas the people of the United States should recognize the time, commitment, and great efforts of the many dedicated citizens who made the refurbishing of Ellis Island the largest historic renovation project in the history of the United States; and

Whereas the people of the United States have a responsibility to maintain awareness of, and respect for, Ellis Island: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That January 1 is designated as "National Ellis Island Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: Page 2, line 3, insert "1992," after "January 1".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution designating January 1, 1992, as 'National Ellis Island Day'".

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the several joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 9, 1991

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit two sealed envelopes received from the White House at 3:14 p.m. on Tuesday July 9, 1991 as follows:

(1) Said to contain a six month periodic report on the Libyan Emergency and

(2) Said to contain the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Act of 1978 Annual Report for Calendar Year 1990.

With great respect, I am  
Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives

#### REPORT ON CONSERVATION AND USE OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS IN FEDERAL FACILITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of Tuesday, July 9, 1991, at page 17420.)

#### REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of Tuesday, July 9, 1991, at page 17419.)

#### REPORT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, July 10, 1991.)

## BRITAIN TO CUT DEFENSE FORCE

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been arguing along with others that with the collapse of the Russian military threat to wage a ground war in Europe, we could have some substantial troop reductions. I have good news and bad news. The good news is that I read in today's Washington Post of even deeper troop reductions for Europe in the NATO forces.

The bad news is that they are not ours, Mr. Speaker. They are England's. In today's Washington Post it says, "Britain to cut defense force by 20 percent over 3 years."

Now, these are the same people who tell us that we have to keep 200,000 troops over there so they can feel comfortable.

The cuts envisioned an annual 6 percent reduction in defense spending.

This recognizes the quantum change that has occurred in the European scene with the collapse of the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact," said the British Defense Secretary.

Pretty soon, Mr. Speaker, there will be more American troops in England than there are English troops.

Now, I think America ought to cooperate with the rest of the world, but 45 years after World War II ended, with these European nations in Western Europe reaching a high level of economic activity, the only reason we continue to subsidize their defense to this extent is our own stupidity.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article referred to above:

[From the Washington Post July 10, 1991]  
BRITAIN TO CUT DEFENSE FORCE BY 20 PERCENT OVER 3 YEARS—QUEEN'S CAVALRY COULD BE PUT TO PASTURE

LONDON, July 9—Citing the collapse of the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact, Britain announced today a 20 percent cut in its defense forces over three years.

The cuts envisaged an annual 6 percent reduction in defense spending, and are deeper than those proposed before the Persian Gulf War. Defense spending this year will total \$38.88 billion.

"This recognizes the quantum change that has occurred in the European scene with the collapse of the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact," Defense Secretary Tom King told a new conference. "Smaller but better has been our objective."

The most drastic cut proposed was for the army to be reduced from 147,000 personnel to 116,000 instead of the 120,000 proposed shortly before Iraq invaded Kuwait on Aug. 2.

That will mean disbanding or merging some of Britain's elite regiments including, according to published reports, the Household Cavalry that provides escorts for Queen Elizabeth II on state occasions.

King, who is allowing military commanders to wrangle over which regiments will go, said the final decision will be announced soon.

The number of Royal Air Force personnel will shrink from 89,000 to about 75,000 and the Royal Navy from 63,000 to about 55,000.

Also cut will be three of the air force's 11 squadrons of tornado fighter-bombers, which played a major role in bombing Iraqi airfields.

British forces deployed in Germany are to fall sharply from 55,000 to a 23,000-strong mobile force. King said the British cuts were in line with a NATO decision last spring to slim down forces from 830,000 to 625,000, including a planned Rapid Reaction Corps to be commanded by Britain and based in Germany.

Britain, which spends 4 percent of its gross domestic product on defense, has ranked among the top spenders in the 16-nation North Atlantic Treaty Organization, after the United States.

King, facing protests from the military said the overall 20 percent reduction in personnel was less than a 25-percent cut announced by the United States and a 30 percent reduction by Germany.

The announcement stipulated that Britain will make no cuts in its nuclear arsenal, now being updated with submarine-launched U.S. Trident missiles that will cost a total of \$14.4 billion.

## VIRGIN ISLAND JUDGES

(Mr. DE LUGO asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before in this House of the dire problems the people of my district continue to face because of the failure of the administration to appoint judges to the bench of the Federal Courts.

We in the Virgin Islands have seen visiting judges come and go, we have seen our court system become suspect because of the absence of locally appointed judges, we have seen in some instances justice miscarried, and we have seen frustration in the legal community and in the community at large because of this problem.

I have written many, many letters to the White House. I have exhorted the President to pay attention to this terrible situation. Judges have even written the Attorney General decrying the situation.

The problem has again been highlighted, this time in an article that appeared in the Monday, July 1, 1991 edition of the Washington Post's magazine, Washington Business, titled "For Some Federal Judges, Long Days in Paradise." In it, Post Staff Writer Sandra Torrey brings into good perspective the problems the people of the Virgin Islands have faced without permanent, sitting judges in our Federal Courts.

Mr. Speaker, today I place this article into the record as further evidence of this embarrassing situation. But I also want to commend Acting Chief Judge Stanley Brotman and the other judges who have worked so hard to maintain the Federal Courts in the Virgin Islands under extremely trying circumstances. I would hope that the President and the Attorney General will take note of this intolerable prob-

lem, and move quickly to remedy it, and bring justice to the people I represent.

## FOR SOME FEDERAL JUDGES, LONG DAYS IN PARADISE

(By Sandra Torrey)

The federal judges shuttle in and out from Richmond and Baltimore, from Los Angeles and Camden, NJ. They start early. They work late. The criminal caseload is crushing. Sometimes they even hold court on Saturdays.

Is this purgatory? No, it's the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The two judgeships in this U.S. territory have been vacant for 18 months, forcing the Virgin Islands to make do with a stream of visiting judges who fly in and out with the tourists.

Sound like a cushy assignment? Not to hear the judges tell it.

Federal judge Stanley Brotman, a senior judge from Camden who took over as acting chief when the Islands' chief judge died in 1989, said you do what you've got to do.

"These courts had to be maintained," said Brotman. "These people are entitled to have matters tried and heard. And I am satisfied that everyone coming down . . . worked very hard."

Brotman does allow that the view over the Caribbean beats the Delaware River most days. And Judge Robert Merhige Jr., a senior judge who came from Richmond last year, said he got in a little beach time, but, of course, only on Sundays.

"Certainly it is not the hardest thing in the world to go to that kind of climate at that time of year," said senior judge Frank Kaufman of Baltimore, who answered the call for volunteers last spring. "On the other hand, I went to work at 8 or 8:30 [a.m.] and it was usually 6 or 7 [p.m.] before I got out."

Many of the Islands' lawyers assert that judges work long and hard as they rotate in and out, juggling caseloads at home and handling the huge court dockets on St. Croix and St. Thomas. Federal judges in the U.S. Virgin Islands hear major felonies, and last year had the highest criminal caseload per judge among all the federal courts.

The problem began in 1986, when Almeric Christian, then the chief judge in the Virgin Islands, wrote to President Reagan, saying he planned to retire but would wait until a successor was named. Frustrated when the White House did nothing, Christian retired in 1988. Then, in 1989, the Islands' only remaining federal judge, David O'Brien, died.

Now 18 months later, their seats remain vacant and as the time passes, there is growing discord in America's island paradise.

"We Need a Judge," read a 1989 headline in the local Daily News. "Civil trials have virtually come to a halt." The editorial stated.

"Meanwhile the backlog is mounting . . ."

Del. Ron de Lugo (D), the Island's nonvoting member of Congress, said "there is absolutely no excuse," for the indifference of the Reagan and Bush administrations. "It's an embarrassment to the United States."

An administration official said President Bush nominated a top-notch local lawyer, only to have the Senate Judiciary Committee toss the nomination back after it languished there for months. Senate sources sniff at that account and hint at unspecified problems with the candidate.

It has been difficult to find other nominees, what with concerns about race, politics, geography and whether the nominee is an Island native, said one administration of-



ficial. Two new candidates are now under scrutiny.

The official said that some candidates "look good on paper and look good in person," but when the FBI starts checking, "they do not always turn out to be without flaws."

But one nominee since 1988? That's not exactly scouring the Islands' 400-member bar association.

Territorial senator Holland Redfield, one of the Islands' few Republicans, figures there's blame enough for everyone. "Backstabbing on a bipartisan basis," said Redfield of local politics. "If they nominated Jesus Christ, someone down here would recrucify him."

Meanwhile, the airports are busy with judicial comings and goings.

At last count, said court clerk Orinn Arnold, 22 judges had served from cities around the nation. "You name it, we've had it," joked Arnold. Many, like Brotman, have come from the 3rd Circuit, which includes Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and the Virgin Islands.

The makeshift arrangement certainly has its downside.

There is no continuity, and scheduling is a nightmare.

One attorney had four judges for one criminal case. In a civil case, lawyers and witnesses flew to New Jersey for a trial, after a visiting judge was forced by his schedule to head back home. At times, a defendant gets one judge at trial, another at sentencing.

Then the judge "is looking at a cold record," said public defender Thurston McKelvin. "He will not have the same flavor or feel for it."

And try as they might, according to local lawyers, visiting judges can't be expected to grasp the culture and fabric of the island. Even the judges do not dispute that.

In a letter to former 3rd Circuit Chief Judge A. Leon Higginbotham Jr., two visiting judges asserted that there is a "sense that justice is being imposed from the outside" in a territory that is predominantly black.

And then there is the cost of the president's failure to name new judges.

"It's got to be enormous," said former Virgin Islands Lt. Gov. Julio Brady, once mentioned as a possible nominee. "The typical judge comes with a law clerk, sometimes a secretary, sometimes a court reporter."

The maximum a judge can spend daily for hotel and meals in the Virgin Islands is \$291 in high season; \$237 in low—the highest per diems in the nation. In the New York City, it's \$227, and in Washington, \$197. The allowance for staff is 50 percent less.

Brotman said he's certain that judges are spending "far less" than the daily allowance.

But no one seems to know just how much this whole venture is costing American taxpayers.

"There is no question it's cheaper to have resident judges appointed, no question about it," said Brotman. "But that's not what has happened."

And the cost may actually be highest in ways impossible to count.

"With each passing week that the district continues without a single resident judge Virgin Islanders become more convinced that they have third-class status in our federal judicial system." Higginbotham wrote last year to Attorney General Dick Thornburgh. "The long-term consequences . . . are tragic to contemplate."

NO MORE ONEK, KLEIN

Onek, Klein & Farr, once called the little law firm that could, is no more. The bou-

tique that was bursting with Supreme Court law clerks and the pick of law school graduates dissolved today.

Joseph Onek and partners JoAnn Macbeth and Laurel Pyke Malson are on their way to Crowell & Moring. Partner Christopher Cerf departed in April for Wiley, Rein & Fielding.

The breakup was spurred by disagreement over growth, lawyers said. Joel Klein and H. Bartow Farr III wanted to stick to their Supreme Court and appellate practice. Onek, with his burgeoning health-care practice, and others, who do trial work, said they needed more resources. For a while, there was merger talk. But none of the firms' suiters made it to the altar.

Everyone assures that the divorce is "harmonious."

Klein, Farr and partners Paul M. Smith and Richard Taranto will stick together. "I feel thankful for the 10 years of remarkable success and fun we've had," Klein said last week, "and sadness that it won't continue."

#### THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOOTENAI COUNTY, ID, TASK FORCE ON HUMAN RELATIONS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAROCO. Mr. Speaker, often it takes a challenge before us to bring out the best within us.

Such has been the case in my great district, the first district of Idaho, where the Kootenai County Task Force on Human Relations is celebrating its 10th anniversary this weekend.

The task force was founded in 1981 as a counterpoint to a local hate group, the Aryan nations, that had chosen Kootenai County as a home for its bigoted work.

The task force has found during the past decade that battling hate can build a community's sense of pride, accomplishment and commitment.

By coming together and working together, the city of Coeur D'Alene and the people of Kootenai County have shown the State and the Nation that bigotry is not tolerated in Idaho. More than that, they have proven to themselves that the truly American virtues of tolerance and respect for others burn brightly in north Idaho.

Allow me to present a brief history of the Kootenai County Task Force on Human Relations:

Begun in 1981, the task force was a response to the activities of the Church of Jesus Christ Christian—the Aryan nations—a violent group of white supremacists which had chosen Hayden Lake, ID, as a base from which to care a whites-only nation in the Pacific Northwest.

The task force helped pass Idaho's anti-harassment law in 1983 that still stands as model legislation for the Nation. In 1984 and 1985, the Aryan nation's ties to violent activities throughout the Nation became clear. Then, in 1986, the home of the task force chairman, Rev. Bill Wassmuth,

was bombed. A week later, three more bombs exploded in Coeur D'Alene. Four people were arrested; all were linked to the Aryan nations. The evil that the task force was fighting became very real.

The task force was honored nationally when it became the first recipient of the Raoul Wallenberg Civic Award on January 14, 1987.

The task force also was instrumental in Idaho's celebration of the first national Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday in 1986, and in pushing for a State holiday, a goal realized in 1990.

The Kootenai County task force on human relations has much to be proud of on this, its 10th anniversary. It has shown the world that Kootenai County, Coeur D'Alene—an all America city—and the State of Idaho will not tolerate racism and will work actively to promote racial understanding and tolerance.

As Father Wassmuth has said: "The best way to say 'no' to racism and intolerance is to say 'yes' to the equality and dignity of all people without regard to race, color, national origin or creed."

I would especially like to acknowledge the four chairmen of the task force: Rick Morris, Rev. Bill Wassmuth, Norm Gissel, and Tony Stewart. Each has given so much time and leadership to make the task force so successful.

I am proud to support the Kootenai County Task Force on Human Relations, to wish them a very happy birthday, and to wish them the best of success for the future.

And, I am truly proud to represent in Congress the goals and the people associated with the Kootenai County Task Force on Human Relations.

□ 2010

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND INTEGRITY AND BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, together with Social Security Subcommittee Chairman ANDY JACOBS, H.R. 2838, a comprehensive Social Security package to improve Social Security benefits and protect the integrity of the Social Security trust fund. This package is intended to address many of the concerns that senior citizens have shared with us—their need to supplement their benefits by working; their concern about the adequacy of their benefits when they are widowed and living alone; their desire to assure that the tax dollars which they have paid into Social Security are spent for the purpose for which they were intended.

The legislation we are introducing today would address these issues in the following

ways: it would improve benefits for the working elderly and for widows; it would establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency; it would remove Social Security administrative costs from the budget; and it would require a study of means of improving the efficiency of the Social Security disability determination process. In addition, to correct an unintended result of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, it would raise the FICA exemption for election workers. Finally, it would comply with the pay-as-you-go financing requirements enacted last year by reversing the decline in the Social Security wage base as proportion of covered wages.

Social Security benefits for the working elderly would be improved by increasing the Social Security retirement test. Under present law, senior citizens age 65 to 69 may earn up to \$9,720 a year and still retain their full Social Security benefits. Above that threshold, they lose \$1 in benefits for every \$3 they earn. H.R. 2838 would permit seniors to earn a higher wage and continue to receive their full Social Security benefits. Specifically, the threshold for 1992 would be increased \$1,200—from a projected \$10,200 to a projected \$11,400. The threshold for 1993 would be increased \$3,000 above current law to a projected \$13,680. In 1993, this would increase the annual Social Security benefit of a senior working at the average wage by \$1,000.

At the same time, the bill would improve widows' benefits in two ways. First, it would increase benefits for those widows whose spouses die before they reach the age of 65. These widows are likely to spend many years living on a reduced Social Security benefit. As they age, their resources are depleted and they often find themselves among the poorest of the elderly. A hearing of the Subcommittee on Social Security found that women living alone are among the most likely senior citizens to live in poverty. H.R. 2838 would improve benefits for these widows by decreasing the reduction factor for early widowhood.

Second, the legislation would eliminate the 7-year rule for disabled widows. The 7-year rule provides that a widow must become disabled within 7 years of her husband's death—or within 7 years of the end of her eligibility for benefits as the widowed mother of a young child—in order to be eligible for a disabled widow's benefit. The 7-year rule is an unnecessary and arbitrary limitation on eligibility for otherwise needy widows. H.R. 2838 would eliminate this limitation.

H.R. 2838 would also increase the Social Security payroll tax exemption for election workers. The present exemption is \$100 annually. The bill would increase the exemption to \$600 and would index the exempt amount beginning in 1993. This change would correct an unintended result of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and thereby preserve the traditional exemption for election workers.

Three provisions in the legislation would protect the integrity of the Social Security trust fund, stabilize the administration of the program, and improve service to beneficiaries. First, the bill would establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency. The agency would be governed by a three-member, bipartisan board which would estab-

lish policy for the agency. The day-to-day operations of the agency would be run by a Commissioner appointed by the President for a 4-year term. In our view, this measure would provide the Social Security Administration with much-needed independence from short-term political pressures. Moreover, it would enhance the stability of the agency and would increase its capacity to attract and retain capable management personnel.

This bill would also remove Social Security administrative costs from the budget, thus assuring that the Social Security trust fund is used for the purpose for which it was intended. Last year, as part of the budget agreement, Social Security receipts and expenditures were taken out of the Gramm-Rudman budget calculations. However, a question has arisen about whether or not administrative costs were intended to be taken offbudget as well. H.R. 2838 addresses this uncertainty by providing that Social Security administrative costs are to be offbudget and removed from the Gramm-Rudman calculations.

This provision is central to the confidence of senior citizens and workers alike in the integrity of the Social Security Program. Today's workers have a right to expect that the Social Security trust funds will be there to pay benefits when they retire, or if they die or become disabled. Similarly, they have a right to expect that those benefits will be both timely and accurate. The 20-percent cut in staff and resources at the Social Security Administration over the last 6 years has dramatically reduced the ability of the agency to provide such benefits, and has reduced the confidence of the American people in the integrity of the Social Security system.

The severity of SSA's service delivery problems was illustrated in a report card on the Social Security Administration that Subcommittee Chairman JACOBS and I issued earlier this spring. In that report, we gave the Social Security Disability Program a failing grade. We issued a failing grade because we found that the average disabled applicant who appeals his disability determination must wait a full year before he receives his benefits. Moreover, nearly two-thirds of the denials that were appealed by applicants were subsequently reversed by an administrative law judge. In our view, Social Security beneficiaries and applicants—individuals who have paid into the Social Security Program during their working years—have the right to expect that the taxes collected for the Social Security Program will be used to insure payment of benefits and services to which they are entitled—and to receive them promptly. Thus, H.R. 2838 would assure that Social Security administrative expenses, like Social Security benefit payments, are offbudget—removed from the Gramm-Rudman budget calculations. I also want to emphasize that I intend to work cooperatively with the Budget Committee to ensure that the administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration are appropriately reviewed.

In addition, we are very concerned with the high reversal rates in the disability program, and feel that it is vital to identify why SSA's initial decisions are so frequently reversed on appeal. Thus, H.R. 2838 would require the General Accounting Office [GAO] to conduct an investigation that would cast light on the

causes of these frequent reversals. With this information in hand, both the Congress and SSA will be equipped to address this severe and pressing problem.

Finally, the bill would phase in a \$3,000 increase in the Social Security wage base by the year 1996—from a projected \$69,600 to a projected \$72,600 in that year. Over the last several years, the proportion of wages covered by the Social Security payroll tax has declined as the wages of upper income individuals have risen faster than the wages of the middle class. This modest increase in the wage base would help move covered wages back toward the levels that prevailed in the early 1980's.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2838 is budget neutral with respect to onbudget spending, meets both the House and Senate requirements protecting the Social Security trust fund reserves, and fully complies with the pay-as-you-go financing requirements enacted last year. It contains several important provisions which will both improve the lives of our senior citizens and their confidence in the integrity of the Social Security system, while assuring that the services they receive from the Social Security Administration are of the highest quality.

#### A TRIBUTE TO REV. CYRIL K. RICHARD AND THE SPIRIT OF SAUGANASH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, nearly 13 years have passed since the community of Sauganash on the northwest side of Chicago lost one of its most beloved community leaders, the Reverend Cyril K. Richard. I remain saddened by the death of this man who was revered by hundreds of people who knew him during his 47-year tenure as pastor of the Sauganash Community Church. Prior to his death in 1978, this pillar of our community was known by the simple term "Rev."

Despite this loss, it gives me great pleasure today to say that the congregation of the Sauganash Community Church has gained a very able successor to Reverend Richard. This man, whose name is Rev. Raymond Nyquist, has embraced the same tradition of neighborhood unity advocated by Reverend Richard, who was always a stalwart booster of Sauganash.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Nyquist has now served as the pastor of the Sauganash Community Church since 1983. His roots in the church and the community go back to at least 1963-64, when he taught Sunday school during his senior year as a seminary student.

As part of his ongoing commitment, Reverend Nyquist recently announced plans to begin writing a regular newspaper column for the Sauganash Sounds, a neighborhood newspaper founded by Reverend Richard in 1931. For several decades, Reverend Richard wrote a similar column for this newspaper, but it was dropped after his retirement. The newspaper, which was originally known as the Sauganash Echoes, also ceased publication after Reverend Richard stepped down, but it was revived in 1978 by church and community



members under the name it bears today. During the many years that Reverend Richard published his newspaper columns, they provided him with an ideal forum for promoting Christian values and community dialog. By reintroducing the column, Reverend Nyquist has pledged to renew this tradition of bolstering the community spirit of Sauganash. I look forward to reading his columns, and I am confident Reverend Nyquist will do justice to the legacy of his predecessor.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in today's proceedings an article from the Sauganash Sounds written by Reverend Nyquist. The article, which follows, details Reverend Richard's contributions to Sauganash during his many years as a pastor.

[From the Sauganash Sounds, June 29, 1991]

#### THEY CALLED HIM REV

(By Raymond W. Nyquist)

His name was Cyril K. Richard, but everyone called him Rev. For 47 years—from 1930–1977 he was the beloved pastor of Sauganash Community Church. The neighborhood was young and vibrant and growing then, and so was he. He was only 30 years old when he began his ministry in Sauganash and he literally grew up and grew older with those who were moving into the area at the time. Were he alive today, he would be 91 years old. Some of you—perhaps many of you—reading these words were his contemporaries. Or you grew up under his ministry. Your children were baptized, confirmed, married by him. And some of your loved ones were buried by him. Indeed, some of you "younger people" were married by him.

He was "Mr. Sauganash." As such he was a Christian gentleman of the first order, with class, integrity, character, and pride—in the best sense of those words. The fact that people called him Rev did not take away from his dignity, but added a quality of affection. Not only did he care for the members of his church, but he was genuinely concerned about all the people of the rapidly growing community. That was why, in 1931, only a year after coming here, he used his journalistic talents to found and publish the Sauganash Echoes, the predecessor of what is now called the Sauganash Sounds. As I write these words I have before me copies of the Echoes that date back to 1957, 1958, and 1959. On the page one masthead, in the upper right hand corner, are the words: "Published Continuously Since 1931." and in the upper left hand corner: "Promoting the best interests of community life."

Significantly, Rev wrote a lead editorial on page one of every issue. He titled it "Column Rite," by C.K.R. In those columns Rev gave his personal and pastoral opinions about anything and everything, from religion to politics, holidays and holy days, family life and community issues, patriotism and personal faith, and everything else that concerned peoples' lives, faith, values, interests, enjoyments, etc. He was out to improve peoples' thinking, broaden their concerns, widen their horizons, and deepen their faith.

Strange as it may seem, I knew Rev personally and worked under him professionally. During my senior year at North Park Theological Seminary, 1963–1964, I was called to be the part-time Youth Director at Sauganash Community Church. I taught Sunday School, assisted in the worship service, but my main duty was to lead the Sunday night Christian Youth Fellowship—a group of about 20 to 40 teenagers, mainly freshmen, sophomores, and juniors. It was

during that year that I came to realize that although Rev was a pastor and preacher, his first real love was journalism. He worked long hours with his personal secretary, Betty Olson, putting the paper together. Almost every Sunday night he would be working late in his study when I would lock the doors of the church and take some young people home. Volume I, number 1, came out in February, 1931. Part of the masthead is printed in the issue of February 21, 1959, celebrating the paper's 28th year.

I personally never called him Rev. I grew up in a church tradition where the minister of the church was called Pastor. And so I addressed him always as "Pastor Richard." Which brings me to the main point of this article.

Bud Hodgkinson, a longtime resident of Sauganash and personal friend, knew me in those days, and when I came to be the pastor of this church, I did not realize then how prophetic those words were!

Rev retired from the church in 1977, and he died the following year. From 1977–1982, two men served the church as pastor: John Jewell, and Jere Stone. I was called to its pastorate in July, 1983. When Rev retired and died, his "baby", the Sauganash Echoes, died with him. But it was reborn, resurrected, in 1977–1978, as the Sauganash Sounds, when a small group of church and community members formed a Board of Directors to keep the spirit of the Echoes alive in the neighborhood.

With this issue, through a special arrangement between the Sauganash Community Church and the Board of Directors, Rev's column will now be resurrected, and as pastor of Sauganash Community Church, I will offer you a regular column, just as Rev did.

Whenever a pastor comes to a new church, people ask him what he chooses to be called. A few people here call me Rev, just as they did Cyril K. Richard, but most people call me simply Pastor. The word means "shepherd." As Jesus was the "Good Shepherd" who gave his life for his sheep, so Rev was a shepherd, a pastor, in the finest sense of the word. And I trust that I follow in his train.

But for this column, just call me Barnabas. The name means "son of encouragement." Barnabas was a character in the New Testament, a leader in the early church, a friend of Paul, and an "encourager" of people. As I write these columns for you, I hope to encourage you, inspire you, and give you hope—that you might be the person God intends you to be. In time, you may call me other names, but for now, just call me Barnabas. And let me leave you with this encouraging word: God knows, and God cares.

#### TAX FAIRNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to take my time this evening with the help of some of my colleagues to talk about tax fairness. Tax fairness has gotten to be a very interesting political issue over the last couple of years, and it raises a number of questions.

Which were fairer, the last Democratic Presidency or the Reagan and

Bush years? Which had a greater impact on jobs and economic growth? Who really pays the taxes?

I think that it is important to look at this from the standpoint that there has been a lot of loose talk without factual backup about tax fairness, that a number of our friends have said, "Oh, all we have to do is raise taxes selectively on the rich," and as we are all learning, for example from the boat builders, if you raise taxes on people who buy a product, then you lay off people who are making the product, and it is not very fair to the thousands of boat workers who are not working today. They think it is sort of downright unfair that the Democratic Party policies would raise taxes and kill their jobs.

There has been a lot of talk about exactly what happened with what was called Reaganomics. President Reagan once said that he knew when his programs were really succeeding; when they quit calling them Reaganomics, and they just sort of happened to have this prosperity.

We have seen what happened in the last 2 years as the Democratic leadership stopped the capital gains tax cut, and the economy went into the first recession since 1982, and despite all of our best efforts, we were not able to convince the Democrats to pass the kind of tax cuts that would improve things.

President Carter invented the concept he called the misery index. He said that the misery index was a combination of inflation and unemployment. In 1976 when he was running for President, he talked about 13.5, and that was the combination of unemployment and inflation, and that was the misery index. After 4 years of Democratic tax increases and Democratic inflation, the misery index had reached 20.6, in fact, its highest point in modern times.

We went through two very difficult years of forcing the economy into a recession, stopping inflation, and we had tremendously high interest rates under President Carter. Inflation was going out of sight.

Then with the help of the Kemp-Roth tax cuts, we began to revitalize the American economy. We began to recreate a new opportunity for jobs, a new opportunity for take-home pay.

It was fascinating back then, because the economy was growing so slowly that there was an estimate that we would not have enough money, and we would not be able to meet our requirements as an economy, but the fact was revenues went up. The tax cuts stimulated growth, and the problems of the deficit turned out to be not a function of revenue but of too much spending on the part of the Congress, and no matter how fast the economy grew, Congress was prepared to spend even faster.

So we now come to 1991. Where are we? We are in an economy which is not growing very fast. We are in an econ-

omy where State after State is raising taxes. Why? Because when they went into the recession, they were not getting enough revenue. In a lot of States—what are those tax increases doing? They are driving the economy even deeper into recession.

In every tax increase that kills a job, it reduces revenue. The fact is if you raise taxes enough for people to close down their business, to lay off their workers so they quit paying income tax, so they start drawing unemployment, the effect of that is to lower government income and to raise government spending, so the deficit gets wider.

In the early 1980's, we had to talk about this all the time. It was a very new idea. Then it turned out to work, and we cut taxes, and we created millions of jobs, 18 million new jobs. We had a lot more take-home pay. Things were beginning to work again. America was on the move.

Then somehow our friends in the Democratic Party began to forget all about the notion that if you cut taxes you encourage investment, you encourage work, you encourage small business, you create jobs, you have more people at work earning more incomes, they pay more income tax, they are not on food stamps, they are not on unemployment, they do not need public housing. So government spending goes down.

We are now back at the same old stand. We are saying exactly the same things we said in the late 1970's and the early 1980's.

I will pose it in a very simple basis. There is nothing fair about losing your job, because government raises taxes too much. There is nothing fair if you are 80 years old and you lose your house because your property taxes went up too much. There is nothing fair about saving for years and hoping finally that you are going to be able, as happens right now, to take a family heirloom in to the jeweler; and discover that when you get that heirloom set, and let us say it is an old cameo that you have put in a piece of jewelry, you do not pay on the new jewelry. You pay a tax, 10 percent, on the entire piece including the cameo which belonged to you. What used to be a simple, inexpensive, easy thing to do that your local jeweler made a little money out of, and your family heirloom looked a little better, is not so expensive that most Americans cannot even afford to do it. That is ridiculous.

We have, in fact, I believe, with the boat tax and with the auto tax, taxes that are so prohibitive that if we had any reasonable computer system in the Congress that measured reality rather than theory, we would find that both tax increases cost money, that we literally tonight are getting less money because we have raised taxes so much that people, for example, quit buying

boats, so boat builders quit hiring people to build boats, so the State did not collect any sales tax, nobody collected any income tax, and the result has been that we have actually lost income to the Government.

Yet the Government computer models are so old fashioned, so obsolete, so out of touch with the real world, that they actually cannot measure what happens in the real world. If you lay off 100 workers and they quit paying income tax, that does not show up when you are measuring the boat tax. If you quit paying sales taxes because you did not sell any boats, that does not show up as a loss of revenue. The only thing they measure is what, in theory, would have happened if, in theory, you had bought the boat.

The funny thing is, and I have to say this for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], who is an economist just walking by, that there is an old story about the economist who was shown the difference between theory and reality and promptly said, "All right, there is a difference between theory and reality. My question is: How do we change reality?" And yet that is exactly what we have here today.

The joint tax committee model is the equivalent of having a computer model at the Department of Defense that said you cannot have an airplane because nothing flies, or of having a computer at the Department of the Navy that said you cannot build any ships because none will float, yet we in Congress continue to follow a fix that we can talk about taxes without regard to the real world.

What is the result then? We did not pass the capital gains tax cut. "Oh, it will help the rich," people said. Who did it really hurt? It hurt every small business person who sold their business. It hurt every retired American who sold some stock they kept. It hurt every small family farmer. It hurt every person who owned a few trees, and in the South we have a lot of timber growers, small family growers, often widowers, often folks who are in their seventies or eighties, who have kept a little piece of 20 or 30 acres who are going to sell off the trees, and they are hurt.

Who else did it hurt? It hurt the 500,000 to 1 million workers who do not have a job today, because we did not encourage building new factories, and so we have an economy with a million more unemployed. We have an economy in which that million people are not paying income tax, and they are taking welfare, food stamps, unemployment, so the government cost in the last year has gone up, and the government revenue has gone down.

We are weaker, because we tax capital gains where Germany and Japan do not. Guess who gets the new factory? Guess who has the new investments?

Guess who is more competitive in the world market?

There is nothing fair about saddling American workers with an old piece of equipment, with an old factory, with inefficient opportunities. That is not fair. There is nothing fair with raising taxes on the American workers so that they are not in a position to be able to buy a car, get a job, buy a house.

I want to start with this notion that I would challenge my friends in the Democratic Party who believe so much in yelling fairness and raising taxes, to explain how they could possibly defend the tax on boats which has just crippled the boat-building industry in America. I do not have any boat builders in my district, and I am not here as a special-interest plea. I am here just as a commonsense plea.

□ 2020

Or to explain, if they were to go to Kansas and talk to the people at Beechcraft, how stopping them from selling airplanes is good for America. It does not make any sense.

Yet, I have heard Democratic leaders come to the floor and say that they will keep the tax on rich, and it is almost as if they were saying it does not matter how many lose jobs, or how many families do not have income. It cannot possibly be fair to have working families laid off and without an ability to earn an income.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was interesting the other day when we had a report come out of a commission, that the Democrats were enthusiastic about, actually increasing the boat tax and the airplane tax. They said that was a tax we could increase in order to get more revenue for all the new programs they wanted to pay for.

The fact is, as the gentleman points out, the tax is losing revenue. They are not dealing in a real world, by suggesting new taxes which are in the real world, losing money; but they are suggesting they will gain money out of it.

Let me also suggest to the gentleman that the thing that the American people, I think, judge fairness by, is what happens to the income of the family during the period of time that policies developed in Washington are working. If we go back to what the gentleman said originally, when the gentleman talked to the fact that we have two records to look at, it is very, very interesting what happens to family in those two periods of time. We have the 4 years of the Carter administration. If we take a look at a chart that the pages are bringing forward here, we find on that chart that median family income, in fact, showed remarkable trends during that period of time.



From 1977 to 1979 there was an increase. That was largely the holdover from the Ford administration policies when Gerald Ford had the guts as President to stand up and veto a bunch of spending bills, and brought down the costs of operations in Washington, and the Nation did experience some increase.

Then beginning in fiscal year 1979, the first real year of the Carter administration policies, we see a remarkable downward trend begin that culminates in 1980, with the worst year in postwar history for American family income. American families lost a remarkable amount of money, almost \$1,200 in a one-year span from fiscal year 1979 to fiscal 1980. The trends continued downward in the fiscal year 1982, and that was largely, again, the holdover of Carter policies. The Carter policies put the United States into a recession, and the recession was a very, very dramatic downturn in the economy by 1980.

Beginning in 1982 when we had the first kick-in of the tax cut policies brought on by the tax cut that the gentleman mentioned earlier, we had a dramatic increase in family income, and that trend is shown again on the chart. We had family income rising nearly \$4,000 during the period of time from 1982 to 1987. That is what real American families regard as fair, when American policies are such that their family income is rising and they are able to pay their bills. That is precisely what happened during the 1980's. It is precisely the kind of policies that the American people would like to see enacted now.

Instead, what they are getting is policies that have changed, once again, and are moving the United States toward higher taxes, which will result in American families having a decline in their income. They will regard that as unfair.

Now, what has been taking place in the Congress, we have people saying, "Well, the whole thing is unfair because we have had a substantial increase by the very richest Americans and not as much of an increase by poorer Americans." The fact is, though, that all Americans did go up, and one of the reasons we have a substantial amount of increase of income of people who are in the highest fifth of the country is because we have so many more of them.

There has been talk on this floor about declining middle class. The middle class has, in fact, been reduced to some extent, measured by income categories, only because they have been moving up, not down. When they moved up, it, in fact, increased the amount of family income available in the upper fifth of income earners in the country. Once again, something that most Americans regard as fair. What they want is to become richer not poorer.

They think those policies are what work.

Beginning in 1986 when we changed the tax law that undermined the whole real estate industry, and extending to last year's budget deal when we dramatically increased taxes and thereby plunged the Nation into a recession, it seems to me that we have gone back to the Carter policies that drove the United States into a recession, and drove down family income.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand for a moment on the comments made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is true that as we see in 1982 when we turned the economy around, and we see the median family income increase, it is true that as we see our official data reported, that people in the higher income brackets, the income reporting is broken down into quintiles: First, second, third, fourth, and fifth. That people in the higher fifths have a higher percentage gain than people in the lower fifths.

It is also true, of course, as the rich got richer by 24.5 percent, the poor got richer, relatively poor, got richer, by 5.9 percent. This is often cited as an inequity in this growth pattern. However, one of the things we have to understand is there is a statistical aberration that affects the higher income quintile, the top fifth. That is why the tax laws caused changes in the behavior of the top fifth, so more of their income, more of their wealth, was held in forms that generated current income flows as opposed to deferred future income flows, and that caused that growth, their wealth was substantially converted then to immediate returns as opposed to future returns.

The other being that the manner in which we collect on capital gains income causes a larger share of the capital gains held by typically more well-off people to be more immediately reported. Capital gains income, of course, is reported only in nominal terms. I will have more to say about that later.

So that even though we see what appears to be a dramatically higher rate of income increase with the higher income American, relative to the lower income American, what has to be recognized is statistical aberrations in that fifth quintile figure that exaggerate by making proper adjustments for behavioral changes, statistical inaccuracies, there would be a greater relationship between the top quintile which nominally is reported at 24 percent gain, and the next quintile of 34 gain.

The base point the gentleman makes is that when we generate prosperity over a 10-year period, all Americans in every income category gain. One of the

things that we find in the nature of the American people is that they are thankful for their own gains, and they are also perfectly willing and happy to see their neighbors gain, even if their neighbors gain more. Americans are not envious, greedy people, but people that are perfectly willing to wish the best for everyone, themselves, and their neighbors.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me follow up on that. I think this chart, we need to look at this chart from a different angle.

It tells Members a lot about the biases in the liberal Democratic wing of American politics, and the biases in this building.

If I were to go up to almost any American and say, "Look, there was a Democratic President, and while he was President, the poorest one-fifth of Americans lost income." That is what it says. The family income for the poorest fifth of Americans dropped under the Democratic President.

Now, there was a Republican Presidency, and during the Republican Presidency, that family income went up by almost 6 percent for the poorest families in America. Which do Members think was better for poor people? Which was fairer? Was it fairer to be poor and have your income going down under the Democrats, or was it fairer to be poor and have their income going up under Reagan and Bush?

Yet in this building, and that reminds me of a story President Reagan used to tell. The difference between America and Britain was that in Britain if a man who was in the working class out wearing a cap and worked in an industrial plant, and his son or daughter was standing there and somebody came by in a Rolls Royce, he would point to it and say, "Someday you and I will be able to take him out of that car and destroy that car." In America, if somebody drives by in a Lincoln or Cadillac, exactly the same income, they look at it and say, "Someday you will be able to buy that car."

□ 2030

The difference is very simple. Our dear friends who talk about fairness drove the poor deeper into poverty, but it was fairer. After all, they only allowed the wealthy to grow by 1 percent and they dropped the poor by about 1 percent, so they were statistically close. Both were miserable. This is why President Carter gave a speech on the whole idea that you really cannot expect anything but malaise. If you look at those numbers, you know why they were for malaise.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. It is very striking, Mr. Speaker, when you see the graphics

here, especially with the color tones. The fact is, if in fact you are concerned about conditions under which the rich would get richer and the poor would get poorer, you have the only recent incidents of this occurring in the period of time from 1977 to 1980. After 1980, the rich got richer and the poor got richer.

Mr. GINGRICH. Exactly.

Mr. ARMEY. Now, which is the better set of circumstances and which is the truly deplorable set of circumstances?

Mr. GINGRICH. And before I yield to my good friend, let me make one more point about this. I went recently and saw the most popular movie, Terminator II, with Arnold Schwarzenegger. Arnold Schwarzenegger was paid \$15 million.

Now if you had a chart and you would have said, how much do we pay Schwarzenegger to play in Terminator II and how much do we pay NEWT GINGRICH or BOB WALKER or DICK ARMEY not to play in anything?

All right, Schwarzenegger makes rather more money, but it also happens to be true that the first weekend it was out a lot more people went to see it and not a single person who bought their ticket resented Arnold Schwarzenegger making some money out of them having a terrific time.

Now, we come back to this whole theory of fairness as described by the left, and I think the gentleman put his finger on it. The only time recently where poor people got poorer under liberal Democrats.

Now, it is true that in order to build new factories, in order to hire more people, in order to create more jobs, in order to increase income, you did have a situation where people tended to do better and were better off than when they started; but everybody was doing better.

I would state that the absolute average American, absolute statistical average right there in that middle group as described by the green color here, would you rather have your growth go up by 0.6 percent or would you rather have your family income go up by almost 11 percent?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let us be clear, though, one is a 4-year period and one is an 8-year period, so it would be 1.2 percent as compared to 10.6 percent. We want to be fair. So it is only 10 times as much, not 20 times as much.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman for his report.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

When you get to conversations about what is the rich and we had that debate on an amendment introduced by the

distinguished majority leader a week or so ago. He could not define the rich. Maybe, he said, it was \$100,000, maybe it was more, maybe it was less.

The rich by definition, and I am giving you now admittedly 1988 figures which are the most recent updates that we have, but the highest 5 percent of wage earners in this country, the highest 5 percent, the rich, if you will, kicked in at \$73,700 a year.

You take the highest 10 percent that year, and these are figures from the IRS and the Treasury Department, the highest 10 percent of all the rich people in this country kicked in at \$58,300 a year.

The highest 25 percent, you know, that is rich, too, by definition, those people kicked in at \$35,600 a year.

The highest 50 percent, because if you are going to break the population down, half is rich and half is poor, right? The highest 50 percent kicked in at roughly \$18,000 a year.

Now, I think more importantly is the percentage of total taxes that the rich pay, because if you get to the highest 50 percent, they are only today paying roughly 95 percent of all the taxes paid to our National Government.

You get to the highest 25 percent, they are paying roughly 78 percent of all the taxes.

Let us go back and review those figures. That is \$35,600 a year and above. You get to the highest 10 percent and they are paying 57 percent, well over 50 percent of the total, 57 percent of all the revenues paid here are from that highest 10 percent, and that kicks in at \$58,300.

You get to the highest 5 percent, those really rich people at \$73,000 and above, and they are paying roughly 46 percent of the total.

If you look at the changes in the Tax Code between 1979 and 1988, and this includes the Reagan tax cut of 1981, his Tax Reform Act of 1986, and you will find that the lowest 50 percent in their percentage of the total paid has dropped 1.3 percent and the top 50 percent has increased 1.3 percent; but if you look at the total paid by all those people in the lowest income brackets, the 50 percent number, that is only 5½ percent of total revenues paid, 5½ percent.

To listen to some of the demagoguery in the debate on this subject suggesting that somehow the Reagan-Bush tax changes have skewed this whole process so now the poor are really taking a hit on the chin is defied by all the statistical evidence.

I think it is clear, the point that the gentleman in the well has made, that when you provide incentives in a code, to be sure the rich can get richer, but the poor can get richer, and the poor can get richer at a faster rate, and that is demonstrable by the evidence, and I commend the gentleman in the well for calling attention to this fact, because

as I say, there has been a great deal of misinformation disseminated on this point.

Mr. GINGRICH. I might comment, Mr. Speaker, if you look at this chart you could argue that the Democrats believe in taxing the rich into poverty. The problem is that they drive the poor into poverty deeper. By the process of taxing the rich into poverty, they drive the whole country into poverty, and I do not think that most of us do not believe our policy goal for America is to maximize the opportunity to be poor. Most of us think that our goal ought to be to maximize, to raise incomes and to raise family take-home pay and to raise the quality of life.

I think if you look at these two charts, the No. 1 conclusion you have to reach, even as my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, if you double the numbers from 1977, I would by the way contest that, if you were to extend this out 2 more years to the full consequence of the Carter policy, it would look worse.

The true fact is the first 4 years are bad. If he had got another 4 years, it would be worse, not better.

Mr. CRANE. Disaster, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, these figures are the good quarters.

Mr. GINGRICH. That is right. He had a slight advantage taking over from President Ford, and then the collapse was coming.

I will never forget how bad it got when we were at 13 percent inflation and 22 percent interest rates and the whole system was just beginning to disintegrate.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, though, you know the perception of our leadership at that time was that we were in a state of national malaise and this country had reached its peak and it had nowhere to go but downhill. With that kind of mentality and the kinds of policies they implemented, they were on the right track to guarantee the fulfillment of that analysis.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman earlier mentioned the fact that he did not have any boat manufacturers in his district. In the State of North Carolina, we have an awful lot of boat manufacturers. Somewhere along the line, the geniuses in Washington, DC came up with the idea of how to generate money was to put a tax on soaking the rich, but that same genius if you applied it across the board would probably say the best thing we could do to raise money in this country today would be to raise the price of everything.



I was thinking, what would happen if we could just raise the price of Kellogg's corn flakes to \$15 a box and tax them at 10 percent like we are doing on yachts. Think of the money we could generate. Of course, I do not know anybody who would eat Kellogg's corn flakes at that price.

Let me just give you some statistics from the State of North Carolina which happened with this 10 percent tax on yachts.

The Hatteras Yacht Company was a very successful yacht builder in High Point, NC. They had at one time over 2,000 employees. Since the tax went into effect, they had to lay off 900 employees. They have given me the statistics to prove this.

You know, this whole tax on boats was supposed to generate \$3 million a year. The payroll, the actual payroll taxes that would have been paid by these 900 workers and the actual profit that Hatteras would have paid on the taxes is actually substantially more than the \$3 million that the whole industry would have generated had they done that.

But let me just add a few more. Hatteras is a big boat builder, but a lot of people do not recognize other people are involved. The Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company in Shelby, NC, makes fiberglass. It takes a ton of fiberglass to build a yacht. With that ton of fiberglass, a lot of people work, but since they were not buying, they laid off 275 people. Those people would have paid \$1,300,000 in taxes had they been working. Now they are drawing unemployment.

The Carver Boat Company of Pender, NC, a little outfit, not so little really once upon a time until this tax thing. They actually had 600 employees and they closed in May. They shut their doors and went out of business.

□ 2040

Outboard Marine Corporation, which is a big outfit, but they also were involved in yacht manufacturing and so forth, and they laid off 250 people.

Buddy Davis Boat Company in Wanchese, NC, laid off 200 people.

Covington Diesel in Greensboro, NC, laid off 54 people.

Just in the State of North Carolina in this year since the 1st of January, 2,279 people have lost their jobs. According to the National Marine Manufacturing Association, close to 19,000 people have lost their jobs.

These would have been taxpayers if our brilliant minds up here in Washington had not put them out of business.

I just would like to say that somebody needs to open their eyes to see what is going on.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me make two points here, one about fairness and the other about just plain intellectual honesty.

First of all, I would argue, despite our Democratic friends, that it is not

fair to have 2,279 families in North Carolina that do not have a job, it is not fair to have 19,000 families around the country that do not have a job.

When they yell fairness, they ought to go and visit the families that are now unemployed because you raised taxes, exactly the way the Democrats like us to.

Second, I would argue that the intellectual lack of accuracy by the Joint Tax Committee and by the Congressional Budget Office and the fact that if you want to walk down there tomorrow—and this is something we ought to maybe consider doing—we ought to take the numbers that the gentleman has, send them down and say "We want you to measure this against your computer and change the computer until you can get to a formula that fits reality. Here we have a real case."

What they would say to you is, "Gee, either these 2,300 people cannot be unemployed because they do not show up on our computer as unemployed or we are not going to count the income tax loss." I mean, imagine a family that said to you—it almost sounds like a teenager—imagine a family that comes in and says—and this is sort of a slur on teenagers, they are actually smarter than most bureaucrats in this setting—imagine a teenager who said to you, "You know, I did not charge a dime on the Mastercard and I do not know why you are talking to me about the Visa card bill because I thought we were only going to measure the Mastercard bill this month. You mean that when I charged on Visa, that was not appropriate?" And that is what you have here. We actually cost ourselves money as a Government and we cost families their livelihood, and it is called fair and they will not even score it, they will not even count it in the congressional Tax Committee.

Mr. BALLENGER. Let me say one more thing: The sad part about it is these jobs are lost now. But you can go to the Bahamas right now and buy used yachts, new yachts, any kind you want to buy, and they are not made in this country anymore.

So, basically, what we have done is we actually have destroyed and if we do not change this tax, we are going to completely destroy an industry that used to be a very successful industry in this country.

These were actually exports.

Mr. GINGRICH. I would be glad to yield to my good friend from Kansas, who I might say has been a real leader on this issue and has introduced a key bill on repealing this tax which is killing jobs.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about this tax. It puts American men and women on the unemployment line, it cripples U.S. industry like we have been talking, and it loses more revenue

than it generates. Now, common sense would tell us this is not a good idea. But that is exactly what the effect of the so-called luxury tax is, that was agreed on by Congress in last year's Budget Reconciliation Act.

A few weeks ago I introduced legislation to repeal the luxury tax to restore and preserve the jobs of working men and women. These are the people in this country who, after all, produce the goods, revitalize the industries which have been severely impacted.

These items may be a luxury to the purchaser, but to the men and women who are producing these goods, their jobs and salaries are a necessity.

Now, the luxury tax does not hit the pocketbook of wealthy Americans. What it is doing is it shortchanges U.S. workers. These people, considering purchasing items Congress has labeled as luxuries, can simply forego the purchase of these products or they buy used ones, which are not subject to the tax.

It is simple economics: When prices get too high, people stop buying the product. And they have.

The matter of fact is the tax missed its wealthy targets and has hit the working class. In my home State of Kansas, we were talking about the boatbuilders a minute ago, in this instance Beech Aircraft in the first 3 months of this year has lost more than \$77 million in new orders for 39 new aircraft, and these have been traceable directly due to the luxury tax.

That equals the loss of more than 250 jobs in 1 year. And now the luxury tax not only leads to higher unemployment and higher unemployment payments, it also costs the Federal Government in lost revenue.

The effect of the aircraft luxury tax on Beech Aircraft alone has cost the Government \$1.6 million in lost income taxes and FICA taxes. How much did the luxury tax from aircraft sales at this same company generate? Only \$16,000. That does not even cover the cost of collecting the tax.

So, it is ridiculous to impose this while the economy is ailing. It is like the medieval physicians bleeding their patients to cure their sickness. It is time the Democrats' prescription for economic recovery to move out of the Dark Ages.

In their haste, the Democrats in controlling Congress, pointed the tax gun at wealthy Americans. They instead shot the working men and women of this Nation right in the back. I firmly believe that every American must pay their fair share of taxes. However, I do not think that the vendetta held by the Democratic Party against wealthy Americans is healthy for our economy.

Before Congress continues to soak the rich, let us look at the facts. The top 10 percent of American wage earners pay 57 percent of all income tax revenues and the top one-half contribute 95 percent of all income taxes.

The Democrats continue to devise new and creative tax schemes to pick-pocket Americans to feed their spending frenzy so they may continue to create their new Federal bureaucratic programs to further their agenda.

To have the Federal Government intervene to solve every problem is a bankrupt idea. It seems to be such a simple concept, but instead of continuing to raise taxes, why not reduce Federal spending?

This Congress should rise to the challenge to redefine the meaning of tax fairness. Tax fairness should mean that all Americans are allowed to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks and require each person to pay their equitable share.

It is always best if we take on this challenge by keeping in mind that Government is at its best when it governs least. The role of the Federal Government should be to help the citizens of this country, but we must realize that the Government cannot accept responsibility to pay everyone's bills.

Mr. Speaker, what would you say about a tax that puts working American men and women in the unemployment line, cripples U.S. industry, and loses more revenue than it generates?

Common sense should tell us that this isn't a good idea, but that is exactly the effect of the so-called luxury tax agreed upon by Congress in last years' budget reconciliation act.

I have introduced legislation to repeal the luxury tax to restore and preserve the jobs of working men and women in this country who produce these good and revitalize industries which have been severely impacted.

These items may be a luxury to the purchaser, but to the men and women producing these goods, their jobs and salaries are a necessity.

The luxury tax does not hit the pocketbook of wealthy Americans. Instead it short changes U.S. workers. Those people considering purchasing items Congress has labeled as luxuries can simply forgo the purchase of these products, or buy used ones which are not subject to the tax.

It's simple economics. When prices get too high people stop buying the product, and they have. The fact of the matter is, the tax missed its wealthy targets and has hit the working class.

In my home State of Kansas, Beech Aircraft, in the first 3 months of this year, has lost more than \$77 million in new retail orders for 39 new aircraft due to the luxury tax. That equals a loss of more than 250 jobs in one year.

The luxury tax not only leads to higher unemployment and higher unemployment payments, it also costs the Federal Government in lost revenue. The effect of the aircraft luxury tax on Beech Aircraft alone has cost the Government \$1.6 million in lost income taxes and FICA taxes.

How much did the luxury tax from aircraft sales at Beech generate? Only \$16,000. This doesn't even cover the cost of collecting the tax.

To impose this ridiculous tax while the economy is ailing is like medieval physicians

bleeding their patients to cure their sickness. It is time for the Democrats prescription for economic recovery to move out of the Dark Ages.

The democratically controlled Congress, in its haste to point the tax gun at wealthy Americans, has shot the working men and women of this Nation in the back.

I firmly believe that every American must pay their fair share of taxes. However, I do not think that the vendetta held by the Democratic Party against wealthy Americans is healthy for our economy.

Before Congress continues to try to soak the rich, let us look at the facts: The top 10 percent of American wage earners pay 57 percent of all income tax revenues, and the top one-half contribute 95 percent of all income taxes.

The Democrats continue to devise new and creative tax schemes to pick-pocket Americans to feed their spending frenzy so that they may continue to create new Federal bureaucratic programs to further their agenda. To have the Federal Government intervene to solve every problem is a bankrupt idea.

It seems to be such a simple concept. Instead of continuing to raise taxes, why not reduce Federal spending?

This Congress should rise to the challenge to redefine the meaning of tax fairness. Tax fairness should mean that all Americans are allowed to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks, and require each person to pay their equitable share.

It is best if we take on this challenge by keeping in mind that government is at its best when it governs least. The role of the Federal Government should be to help the citizens of this country; but we must also realize that the Government cannot accept responsibility to pay everyone's bills.

Those are some comments I wanted to make in connection with the same discussion that we were having.

Mr. GINGRICH. I would like to for a second, if the gentleman does not mind, if I may say to my friend from Kansas I want to go back because I think the information the gentleman brought us is so amazing and so specific.

Am I correct in understanding that in order to get \$16,000 from Beech Aircraft the Government killed 250 jobs and lost \$1.6 million? Are those numbers accurate?

Mr. NICHOLS. Those have been traced directly by the officials of Beech Aircraft, yes. And they talked to the people who were going to buy the planes, who committed that they were, and traced it back. These are not hypothetical examples.

Mr. GINGRICH. And these are not people who were called and actually said that, these were actually people who were right on the verge of buying?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes, they were.

Mr. GINGRICH. They saw that extra 10 percent and said, "Whoops," and they backed away.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes. They would not pay it. They could pay it, perhaps, but they would not because of that luxury tax.

Mr. GINGRICH. Maybe people in Kansas have more sense than folks on the Joint Tax Committee. Let me just ask you—in fact, I am certain they do because—well, let me ask you: Does it not seem to the gentleman a bit steep that in order to pick up \$1 you have to give back \$100?

Mr. NICHOLS. Incredible.

Mr. GINGRICH. I mean does it not strike the gentleman in terms of Beech Aircraft this may be one of the least effective, most destructive exchanges in American history? That in order to gain \$16,000 you have to give up \$1,600,000? Can you imagine if you went to the people in Kansas and said to them, "I have this great deal. You write me a check for \$16,000; I will write you a check for \$1,600,000?"

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas. I knew I would get his attention.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is fascinating. Let me see if I can add to it.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think our friend from Kansas has brought us an actual case study that is unbelievable.

Mr. ARMEY. We have a situation where the Government, the Congress, the Democratic majority in Congress, decided it was only fair if we soak the rich with a luxury tax which they applied on airplanes, in this instance. Having imposed this tax, they closed the major manufacturing concern, major employer in the gentleman's district in Kansas to lose how much in sales?

□ 2050

Mr. NICHOLS. Seventy-seven million dollars in 3 months.

Mr. ARMEY. \$77 million in sales lost to a private concern in the country, and how many jobs lost?

Mr. NICHOLS. That equals the loss of more than 250 jobs in a year's time.

Mr. ARMEY. 250 jobs lost.

Now what they did then was to receive revenues over this period of time to the Treasury of how much?

Mr. NICHOLS. They received revenues from the luxury tax?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. \$16,000.

Mr. ARMEY. So what they do, and I want to talk about how they reckon things up in this town. The first standard of success that they will apply to any public policy is: What does it do for us? That is to say: What does it do by way of bringing money into the Treasury?

So, they would look at this, and they would say, "Well, we brought in \$16,000. That's a good deal."

In other words, what they do not reckon, they do not count, they do not consider important, is what is it doing to the American people. The \$77 million in lost sales, that is a matter of no consequence to the decisionmaking process here; 250 jobs lost.



Now, if my colleagues will imagine 250 people lost their jobs, families without income, and what is also hidden in that is lost income tax revenue to the Treasury from the incomes that are not going to be generated from the \$77 million worth of sales that will not be made in the 250 jobs that went up. So, the Government may actually have had a net loss of revenue even onto itself because they refused to take into account in their calculations these very real economic effects of their ill-advised policy.

Mr. GINGRICH. I just realized because I did a little bit of math work because the gentleman suddenly got me intrigued with this that we have been in this room when our liberal, Democratic friends jumped up and said, "We need to create jobs. Let's have a government jobs program. Let's create 70,000 jobs out of the Government," and they literally pay \$70,000 through the bureaucracy to hire somebody at \$23,000. This tax at Beech Aircraft was killing a job, if I got my numbers right, for every \$64 in taxes. In order for the Government to get \$64, it was literally killing a job. That is the average.

Now this has got to be one of the most destructive policies ever adopted on a job-per-dollar-of-taxation basis.

Mr. ARMEY. The question then of fairness is: "At what point is it fair for me to take your right to a job away from you? If I make \$64, and you lost your job, that's fair."

Mr. GINGRICH. And that does not count the fact that now that I have killed the gentleman's job, I am now going to have to tax everybody else or borrow the money in order to pay for food stamps, and public housing and welfare because I have now knocked the gentleman out of work.

So, my colleagues have this poor person in Kansas in this case who wants to go to work. They are ready to go to work. Beech Aircraft, I gather, would be quite happy to have them go to work. Everything would work out fine except that the Government under the leadership of the congressional Democrats has once again raised a tax, killed a job and weakened the family.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Just very briefly, I just noticed that, if each one of these jobs averaged an income of \$30,000, the average tax that they would be paying is \$2,800, around \$2,800 a year. So, if my colleagues extrapolate that out, 250 jobs lost at \$2,800 in taxes, then the liberals here in the House cost the Government \$700,000 in lost income taxes.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, we lost that much money in lost income taxes, and yet theoretically we raised \$16,000. Now the Democrats can see the absurdity of that. They see the number of people that are losing their jobs all

along the East Coast and elsewhere, and so even now they are frightened and wish to do something to correct it.

The reason we are here is because we have a bill to correct it, but, my colleagues, the Democrats under this operation are now unwilling to pass the bill because under their thought process, never mind the loss of jobs, never mind the collapse of the industry, never mind the hundreds of millions lost in revenue, the \$16,000 that they collected is their concern, and so they want to get \$16,000 from some source, and the reason the bill will not move out of committee is because they need somewhere to make up the \$16,000 they are going to lose because they have the incapacity to understand that, if they repeal the tax, millions of dollars will come in from the example that we just used.

Now we have a textbook example. We do not have to talk about trickle-down. We do not have to use an educated, sophisticated economic model. We have to just put two plus two equals four. All we have to do is to get people to see that when we take away their job, they no longer contribute to the economy, and that is exactly what this tax does.

The main reason that I wanted to take just 30 seconds though for our benefit of our colleagues that are trying to watch this on the floor is for everyone to understand the Democrats control everything that happens in the House of Representatives. A person cannot call a vote without the approval of the Speaker. A person cannot make an amendment on the floor without the approval of the rule. No bill comes to the floor, and, lo and behold, a Member cannot even speak unless a Democrat chairman gives him permission to rise.

The only exception to that is what is called special orders at the end of the day, and this is the only time that we as Republicans can have our own time in which to speak to the House that is followed by electronic means. Because we are trying to communicate our message, the Democrats, who control the electronic means, choose to roam the cameras around so that one cannot follow what we are saying directly, and neither can they follow the charts when they are pointed out by Members using them on the floor. That is obviously an effort to subvert and thwart even our discussion, even our free speech of the cause to which we have been elected, and the reason I wish to take this moment is to emphasize for those like myself who are trying to follow this debate in our offices, are unable to do so because we cannot see the charts because the Democrats, who control the House of Representatives, who control everything that happens here, who control even the cameras and the microphones, have denied us access to that vehicle, and I resent it. I think it is unnecessary. I think it is power run amuck.

Mr. GINGRICH. Can I ask, because I did not realize? In other words, they were not picking up this particular chart when we talked about it?

Mr. DELAY. Not when it was referred to.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues that I was trying to follow it. Instead this camera up here is roaming the Chamber controlled by the Speaker of the House who is the Democrat who controls those microphones.

Mr. GINGRICH. It is sort of childish because the objective reality is there are at least as many Members on the floor right now as there are for about 60 percent of the legislative debates during the course of the legislative day. That is the way the House operates, and the objective reality is, if it is a good topic and it is a good discussion, the country ought to be able to follow it at their will, and it ought to be handled in a neutral manner so that everybody, whether you are a liberal or a conservative, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, everybody has a reasonable chance to be heard by the country.

It seems to me that is the essential point we ought to make is we are not asking for special rights for ourselves. We think this ought to be a serious place and should not have childlike games being played during the special orders. Special orders ought to be real opportunities as we are having tonight.

I would love to have one of the Democrats who believes in raising taxes come to the floor and explain to our friend from Kansas why the employees at Beech Aircraft ought to be laid out of work. I think it would be fine to have them come over and have a real debate about the cost of tax increases and whether or not it is worthwhile to make Americans unemployed.

I yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. NICHOLS. I might just say one comment, if I could, editorial comment. Among papers in my district it has been unusually favorable to this idea. They know what has happened. They want a change to be made. They do not like this soak-the-rich plan and shoot the working man in the back. They found out what happens, and they are very favorable toward the whole idea.

Mr. GINGRICH. That is great, and I wish you luck, and we are certainly going to be supporting you in your bill to repeal this tax which is killing jobs.

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a little bit about tax fairness in New Hampshire, and truly New Hampshire is hurting. Fifty thousand people are out of work. During the early and the mid-1980's New Hampshire had the lowest unemployment

rate east of the Mississippi. Every sector of the economy was doing well. Tourism, which is the State's largest industry, the service industry, housing, manufacturing, high tech, name it, we had it. But then in 1986, in the wisdom of the liberal tax planners, tax reform changed all of this. Now we have a different economy, high unemployment. Five out of seven banks are going down the tubes. Our Public Service of New Hampshire and electric co-op are both going bankrupt. We have been selected way back about a year ago to be the first base to be closed, the Pease Air Force Base.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I look at this past year so-called tax reform, the budget bill which raised taxes to balance the budget 5 years out, which certainly has been eluding us and appears to be eluding us even in year No. 1.

□ 2100

We raised the gas tax by 5 cents a gallon instead of putting it in the trust fund. We took 2 and a half cents to reduce the deficit. We raised taxes by initiating the sales tax which has been so eloquently discussed here. The luxury tax, we destroyed the luxury car market and the boat market. We seem to feel that once we make a done decision, we cannot change it.

We are losing jobs. We are shutting down industries. We cannot collect taxes on products that do not sell. We have created disincentives, and we, the Government actually, are in the process of destroying these industries.

We have no need for an offset. Let us step back for a minute and take a look at why our economy has slowed down, our tax revenues are down. We have a lot of people out of work. Why do we sit back and do nothing? Let us repeal the luxury tax. It was a dumb idea. It did not work. Let us make it right. Let us send it down the road like we did section 89.

Eighty-five percent of the jobs in America are created by small business. I am a small businessman, and with this in mind, on October 15, I introduced my Jobs for America Act which reinstates the 5 percent investment tax credit for business and industry and reduces the tax on capital gains to 15 percent for all Americans.

Let us talk about what an investment tax credit would do for business. First of all, it would go right to the bottom line. If a businessman decided to invest in his business, he obviously would plan for success. As he planned for success and that got enacted, he invested in the future of his business. He would hire more people. And as he hired more people, his business would improve and ultimately pay more taxes. The people he hired would pay more taxes. So in total, the investment tax credit is merely a pump primer for more taxes to come.

I think it is a basic concept, two and two equals four. I do not think that it

is going to be a cost to the economy. I think it is going to be an expansion of the economy.

Take a look at a lower capital gains rate. If we drop the capital gains rate to 15 percent, it would create much-needed capital. It would reward entrepreneurs who are willing to put capital at risk. It would create jobs and, again, people who work pay taxes.

In spite of this, we as a country, even at a 15-percent rate, would be one of the highest capital gains rates in the world. Japan is basically around zero. Germany is zero, long term. Canada is zero. Other countries are far below. It we take a proactive role, we can expand our economy back to approximately \$80 to \$85 billion a year instead of the less than \$40 billion that we are now seeing this year.

Both of these measures will create more revenue than they will cost. They will create jobs. They will improve our ability to compete worldwide and an ability to compete internationally and allow us to regain our manufacturing industries.

Tax fairness, whether it is in New Hampshire or any State in this great country, we now need to take our heads out of the sand. We need to start doing something positive to get Americans back to work. That is what tax fairness is all about.

Thank you very much.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say, when one talks about fairness, and we have been talking about jobs, some things people need to remember. The bottom point for the middle American family was 1980. That was the lowest, worst single year for family income.

In that year, a middle American family between inflation and taxes lost \$1,800 in buying power. Literally \$1,800 less at the end of the year than at the beginning. If that trend, if the Democratic economic policies of the late 1970's had continued, American families would have lost \$12,600 in real income by 1990. Imagine. If the American family in this country today, instead of having growth in the 1980's had lost \$12,600 in real spendable income, imagine those who are watching tonight and those in our offices, figuring out how much worse off your life would be if you had \$12,600 less.

Instead we saw something very different. The fact is we saw a dramatic increase in the number of jobs. Economic growth in the 1980's meant more jobs. Twenty-one million more jobs, and those jobs were everywhere.

Between 1982 and 1989, employment grew by more than 5 percent in nearly every State and by more than 15 percent in 27 States. We have been talking today about people being laid off in North Carolina, people being laid off in Kansas. Just consider the difference. When we were cutting taxes and encouraging investment, encouraging people to work harder, in 27 States we

had a 15 percent increase in the number of jobs in the 1980's.

In fact, in 1989, the share of working-age population with jobs stood at a record high of 63 percent, up from the 58 percent back in 1983. So if someone wanted to find a job before this recession began, that person had a very good chance. And then we started raising taxes.

We went into a recession, and we did exactly the wrong thing. Furthermore, everybody was improving. The fact was that in 1977, the percentage of families with a middle income between \$15,000 and \$50,000 was 60 percent. In 1989 that dropped to 53 percent. But what happened was not people dropping out, despite all of the Democratic rhetoric.

The fact was, the number of those with a low income under \$15,000 fell from 19 percent in 1977 to 18 percent in 1989.

What happened was, those with a higher income above \$50,000 rose from 21 percent in 1977 to 29 percent in 1989.

Let me repeat that. In the 1980's, more people earned more money.

I ask my colleagues, if I told them about a country in which more than one out of every four families earned over \$50,000 or a country in which only one out of five, which is better off? The country with one out of five earning over \$50,000 or the country with one out of four? Common sense would tell you it is better off for more families. Eight percentage points, almost one out of every 10 American families made it into the \$50,000-plus bracket.

That does not mean we ought to forget people who are below \$50,000. It means we ought to say to them,

You are darn right, we care about you. We want to raise the opportunity to have investment. We want to raise the opportunity to have a small business. We want to raise the chance for you to work full-time and have good take-home pay, and we do that by lowering the tax on investment, lowering the tax on small business, lowering the tax on savings, so that you have a chance that you, too, can someday live a very good life.

What do we discover? Despite the facts, the facts that I think even our friends the Democrats recognize about unemployment, about lost taxes, about lost jobs, I think it is fair to say that the Democrats would rather save face than save jobs.

They have adopted this policy of raising taxes and are not going to back off just because the facts prove that families are being lost in terms of jobs, families are being lost in terms of their homes. After all, you have been working at an aircraft company, you have been working at a boat building company, you have been working at Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company, working pretty hard, making the mortgage payment, trying to save a little bit so your child can go to college.

We raise taxes. Your job collapses. That family faces a very real, very human problem. I think it is up to us



to drive home the message again and again, and to urge the American people to contact their Congressmen and insist on the passage of a repeal of this tax on jobs because that is what it is.

I think it is also incumbent upon us to insist that the Joint Committee on Taxation change the way in which it calculates taxes. I think it is outrageous. I thought the gentleman from Kansas was exactly right when he said that we have economic policies in Washington that are just like medieval medicine, that bleed the patient when the patient is weak.

Raising taxes in a recession is wrong. It made me realize that what we are looking at on the Joint Tax Committee is medieval economics. We are looting at people who are cooking the books in absolute violation. One of the challenges I am going to make tonight, and I hope my friends will join me in sending a letter, is I want to take the actual numbers from real companies, about real people, and real jobs and real lost income and real lost taxes, send it to the Joint Tax Committee and ask them to reconcile their computer model with reality and report back to us so we can get a real number, because my guess is if we would repeal the tax on boats and the tax on cars and the tax on airplanes, we would increase government revenue by putting people back to work.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the point the gentleman is making is important in another way. All over the country at the present time there are States and localities that are in major economic difficulty. Those difficulties are being translated into higher taxes at the local level, and most of those difficulties have come about because the jobs have been lost in the economy and thereby are lost to the localities and to the States as well as to the Federal Government. And so we have created a problem not only for the Federal Government. We have created a problem for States and local governments as well, and it is a tragedy which is then going to have the reverse impact of feeding on itself when taxes have to go up in States and localities in order to pay for all of this economic devastation.

It just makes no sense at all. The American people understand that there is something out there that is not making sense, but they also understand that there is a bill being passed on to them that is being called fairness. That is not fair at all. It is the ultimate example of unfairness, to have taxes going up at all levels, and have those taxes then further dragging down the economy and putting people out of work, which is exactly the trickle down economics, where Washington creates taxes that destroy the economy for middle America.

□ 2110

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman raised a very good point, which is if we had continued the economic growth the tax cuts had led to, New York City would not be in much of a crisis, California would not be in as much of a crisis, teachers could be paid more, there could be better health care. The money would be there, because Americans would be working at better jobs with higher incomes paying more taxes, and not feeling the burden, because they would be better off.

So in a very real sense, as taxes crush the economy, it is also now coming home to roost by crushing city hall and crushing State government and causing the crisis we see in State after State. Because in the absence of economic growth, it is impossible to sustain the government we now have, and the result is you are seeing all over the country an enormous crisis in local governments brought on because the national economy is not growing the way it was.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield, the problem in States like Pennsylvania, what is going to happen is they are going to raise taxes in Pennsylvania to make up for deficits created by a lack of economic growth, which is going to further retard economic growth. So the whole cycle feeds upon itself, and it feeds in a way that brings about a downward trend.

#### TAXES AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members participating in my special order can revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by congratulating our distinguished whip in starting out these special orders on tax fairness. I have never quite witnessed such a presentation, to lay out the real problem about tax fairness. Tax fairness is a term that was coined by the Democrats about a year ago in trying to destroy the reputation and the wonderful results that we have witnessed from the Reagan-Bush administration, and now going into the Bush administration, the wonderful things that have happened, the economic growth that we have experienced in the eighties, and especially pulling it out of the doldrums of the seventies and the Carter years.

We have experienced this head bashing, I guess one would call it, by the liberal Democrats, in trying to destroy

what the Americans are starting to realize, that the economics, the Reaganomics, as it was once called, does bring opportunities for middle income, all income families, of this country. They are trying to destroy that reputation and the wonderful results of the Reagan era.

Mr. MCEWEN. If the gentleman would yield, I wish to follow up on something that the distinguished whip said moments ago and about the conditions. I need to use the chart. The median family income would best communicate it.

Mr. DELAY. This chart here, that I hope is being showed by television?

Mr. MCEWEN. No, the one that is green, that is probably not being shown.

Mr. DELAY. I will be glad to put it up, so the television can pick it up.

Mr. MCEWEN. The point is, in 1976, the inflation rate was 4.6 percent, the prime interest rate was 6¼, and the economy was growing.

We chose a high tax, high spend liberal to occupy the White House, who began to use his policies to turn that around, because the economy was growing and prospering.

He said, "We can put a stop to that; if we increase tax on production, savings, and investment, than we can slow down the economy. Of course, we will have to cover the deficit with increased moneys."

So their policies were successful in what they had sought to accomplish, so that by 1980, inflation had jumped to 18 percent the last quarter of 1980. Interest rates are always higher than inflation. Interest rates then were 21 percent, and the economy was in the doldrums.

Now, when you are a liberal, it means never having to say you are sorry. You never turn and look in the mirror and say, "I did what was wrong for the economy. I did what was wrong for families. I destroyed the growth and opportunity of our Nation. Therefore, I need to reverse position."

No, no, no, no, no. What they say is, you remember Mr. Carter got up on his tippy toes, looked at America, and said, "It is your fault. You are not saving enough. You are not producing enough. In fact, the whole country has entered a malaise."

Then all of the experts ran to the cameras to explain that the reason that America was not competing internationally, the reason we were losing jobs at the rate of 50,000 a week, was because America basically was ill and sick, and that the solution to that is we just had to lower our expectations.

The head of the Council of Economic Advisors, Alfred Kahn, said this. It is 1980, the fellow running the Nation, the Chief Advisor to the President on how to have a strong economy, said this.

"The question for the 1980s is not whether or not America will have a de-

clining standard of living. The question is whether or not Americans will learn to adapt to their declining standard of living."

That is the head of the Council of Economic Advisors. That is the spokesman for the President. That is their view for the future.

Jerry Brown, the Governor of California, said, "We have entered an era of limits."

The leading candidates, speaking surrogates for the President, Mr. Carter, said that we had entered an era of limits, in which we need to learn to live with less. Wear your sweater, ride your bicycle, turn your thermostat. America is coming to an end next Tuesday a week. There is not anything anybody can do about it.

So this 70-year-old man, raised in the 1920's, came in and said very simply, "There is nothing wrong with America. There is just some severe problems with what the leadership in America has given us."

I remember the day the vote was taken here. Do you remember the Speaker came down off of the microphone. He grabbed that microphone right there, and he pleaded with us. He pleaded with us.

He said, "The greatness of America has been the capacity of the Congress to deliver more and more government every year." He said, "If we reduce the resources of government," that is taxes, he said, "you will destroy the greatness that is America."

Indeed, the spokesman for our side was GUY VANDER JAGT, who stood right where you stood, and who said, "The greatness of America has never been what Congress did. The greatness of America has been what a free society has been able to do for themselves."

Indeed, this one-sixth of the population of the world has created as much wealth as the rest of the world combined. In our 200-year history, we have produced as much wealth as the rest of the world combined.

He said, "The surprising thing is, they have been able to accomplish so much so rapidly and carry so much government along with them."

He said, "If we reduce some of the constraints of government," now picture the scene, this is 1981. Every economic journal for the last 2 years has explained that America has entered an era of limits, America needed to learn to live with less, we could not compete. Everyone conceded that point. We were losing jobs at the rate of 50,000 a week. America was in a decline.

GUY VANDER JAGT stood there and said, "If we reduce the constraints of government, we have yet to see the greatness that is America."

Indeed, we took the vote, and do you know what the margin was? The margin was one vote, one single vote, in which we were able to overturn the rule to allow the President of the United

States, Ronald Reagan, to have his tax policy heard here on the floor.

What did we do? We lowered the cost, the tax, on production. We lowered the tax on capital formation, which is needed. About \$140,000 for every job. If you want to hire two people, you have got to get \$280,000 together to hire two people.

So we reduced the tax, which is the penalty on forming that money.

Out of the 17 major industrial nations in the world, from 1982 to 1985, we were the cheapest. If you wanted to invest someplace, America was the cheapest place in which to invest.

So what happened? In the 1970s, nobody wanted to invest here. Americans did not want to invest here. If you built a plant, you built it in Brazil, you built it in Taiwan, you built it in Mexico.

During the 1980's, if you were a businessman any place on the planet, you built a plant one place. If you were a German businessman, if you were a British businessman, if you were a German business person, if you were an American business person, if you were an Argentine business person, you built a plant in one place—the United States of America.

Indeed, from 1982 until 1990, two out of every three jobs created on this planet was created in one country—the United States of America.

Now, let me explain this. If you take all of the jobs created in Japan, all of the jobs created in the Pacific Basin, all of the jobs created in Europe, all of the jobs created in Germany, all of the jobs created in Africa and South America, and you put them all in a pot, and you double them, you still do not have as many jobs as were created in the United States of America from 1982 to 1990.

Now, at the rate of 230,000 jobs a month, every month, for 8 years, and people are now no longer living in a decline, in fact they are buying bigger and better cars and building larger homes than they built in 50 years, and America is growing and prospering, what do you do with facts?

When confronted with a fact which is absolutely unalterable and truth, what do you do with that? And you are Jesse Jackson?

Well, you say, "Never mind the fact you are making your mortgage payment and you now have a job, and you are not dependent, and you are not declining, and you are not riding your bicycle, and you are producing. You have got a rotten little job. Your jobs are not any good. You have got a mick job. You have got a hamburger flipping job. It used to be you had a good job, and when we came in you did not have any job at all, and the future was you were supposed to use those. But, all right, we have got to concede under Reaganomics you have got jobs, but they are rotten little jobs."

Let us look at the facts. During any period of expansion in this century, and the jobs increase, a fourth of the jobs, a fourth of them were in the top paying category.

Under this expansion, since 1982, 47 percent, or half of all the jobs created since 1982, are in the top paying category of highly skilled managerial level.

□ 2120

That means education is very important. Nevertheless, that is where they were created.

What about the bottom category, what about the hamburger-flipping jobs, what about the jobs we hear so much about that everyone got? Seven percent of all jobs created after 1982 are in the bottom category of the one-fourth division. What does that mean? That means that 93 percent of all jobs created were in the middle or upper income categories since the expansion.

So what do we do when faced with those truths? A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still. So they say never mind to the fact that Ronald Reagan went on nationwide television and seduced a cut in taxes on productive people, we can pay who are strong little by little, and we can undermine this. We can do away with the depreciation schedule and we can increase the taxes, we can increase the luxury tax on people who are riding in yachts, and we can take a shot at anybody who owns a yacht if they happen to have the audacity to be successful, or to purchase an airplane, and then we can take the supplies and tax them too, because most people do not have airplanes and so, therefore, we will be able to do all of these things to the economy, and we will get back to our own political goal which is to help create poor people, help create dependency on Government, because that is where our strength comes from. Our capacity to maintain political power is dependent upon as many people as possible being dependent upon our largess, and if they are able to function under their own power and produce under their own will, then they are no longer dependent upon us, and they are contributing to the economy and we will lose our political power base.

That is what this is all about, not about truth, not about fact, or upon a general conclusion as to what has been official for America, but upon who wants political power in 1992.

Anyone who looks at these facts has to conclude that it is better for the employees, better for the Nation, better for the national debt if this luxury tax were to be repealed, and yet we are here to say tonight look who is holding this up. It is the Democrat majority here in the Congress.

Mr. DELAY. I really thank the gentleman from Ohio for making such an eloquent statement. I want to add to



what he said and expound on it, because the American people have to understand that we have not stopped with the outline that the gentleman from Ohio has laid out here. It continues on.

I was just informed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the majority leader was down here last week or 2 weeks ago in a 1-minute defending, defending the luxury tax that we have been discussing here today. Not only that, but a few weeks ago a Senator from Tennessee, Senator GORE, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] introduced a bill, the Downey-Gore bill, that started class warfare. They are not happy with using this myth of taxing the rich and we will help the poor. In actuality what they are doing is taxing the rich and putting the poor out of jobs. They are not happy with that. They want to create class warfare by introducing a bill that appeals to the most basic desire of every husband and wife in this country, every mother and father in this country, and that is the desire to give their children a better life than what they had. They appeal by saying we are going to cut the burden of child dependency by giving you a tax credit for every child that you have, and the way we pay for that is to tax the rich. We are going to add an extra surcharge, or an extra tax rate in the income taxes on the rich to pay for this. We all know what the results would be.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, I mentioned this earlier, but it bears repeating maybe at this point, because the Rockefeller Commission the other day reported on children and it was suggesting the tax credit, which I happen to think is a good idea too.

Mr. DELAY. I think it is a great idea.

Mr. WALKER. We ought to cut the taxes, period. But the way they were going to pay for it was to do what? To raise the luxury tax. One of the things that they were going to use to get the revenue that they thought they needed for this whole program was to raise the luxury tax, a tax, as we have pointed out tonight, that is an abject failure.

Mr. DELAY. Yes, that is a tax failure, and according to them, that is tax fairness.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I am happy to yield to the great and distinguished economics professor from Texas and one of the members of the Texas Six-Pack that came in 1985.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I cannot resist talking about this business of tax fairness as it relates to the excise tax we have talked about, and the boat tax and the blue collar workers who have lost their jobs, and we have talked about the tax on airplanes and the number of blue collar workers there who have lost their jobs.

The thrust of this whole business was, "We have got to get the rich. It

ain't fair," the Democrats said. "They got more money than the poor folks and that is not fair."

They forgot that America's great promise is equality of opportunity, and they retranslated that into the Democratic objective of equality of outcome and, consequently, the fact that some folks had done better than others was unacceptable. Then they applied the tax.

I understand that it is very easy to stand up there like a demagogue and say on jewels that Zsa Zsa Gabor, if she wants to buy more jewelry, should pay this extra tax. I guarantee you that Zsa Zsa Gabor has all of the jewelry that she needs, and she will not get hurt. Elizabeth Taylor has all the jewelry she needs, and she is not going to be hurt by this tax. She sells her jewelry so that she can contribute to Democrat campaigns.

But I want to talk about two rings, because this is a rather interesting case. My mother and father got married in the early 1930's. They were children of the Depression. They had no money. They bought a very simple wedding band for my mother, minimum requirement for a marriage ceremony, very inexpensive, but it did the job. It got them hitched and they stayed hitched until they died.

They went through the war, they went through difficult times, and they did in fact build a business together. In the late 1960's they were able, through that business, to generate enough of an income so that they go back and do for themselves what they had not done at the time that they were married, and they bought for each other on their anniversary a diamond ring. Each ring had five diamond stones, and the stones were nearly, as close as possible, identical.

Had this special punitive tax on the rich been in effect, they would have paid a special tax on those rings, and perhaps might not have been able to afford them, but they did.

Then subsequently when my father passed away he willed his ring with his five diamond stones to my brother. My brother had the ring reset for his wife. Had this tax been in effect at that time, he would have had to pay a special excise tax over the entire assessed value of the newly reset ring, not just the cost of the new resetting, but the entire cost of the diamonds as well that had been in the family at that time for several years.

This is a family that is not replete with diamonds, where diamonds do not run amok in my family. I have three little tiny things called diamond chips in my wedding band, and I am very proud to have them.

When my mother died she left her five diamonds in her ring for me. I had them reset in a ring for myself. Had this tax been in effect, I would have paid a special luxury tax on the entire

value of the new ring with her five diamonds reset in that ring, not a tax on what was newly acquired in this process, but the new assessed value of a new ring.

This is a little thing, but it is a thing that will never affect Zsa Zsa Gabor, it will never affect Elizabeth Taylor. It will affect that working family where somebody in the family in some generation or another acquired, through a lifetime of savings, that very special piece of jewelry that they want to pass on to somebody in a subsequent generation.

Mr. DELAY. I want to make this very clear. Is the gentleman telling me that that tax could actually reach someone that would not be considered rich?

Mr. ARMEY. Absolutely.

Mr. DELAY. It was told right down here on the floor of this House that this luxury tax would not touch anybody but the very rich.

Mr. ARMEY. No, but again let me remind the gentleman if in fact you have a family heirloom, let us say you have a stone that is worth \$5,000 that has been in the family for two generations.

□ 2130

And you have that reset at a cost of \$300 into a new ring; now, you do not pay a luxury tax on the \$300 for the new setting. You are required under this law to have the entire value, assessed value, of the ring, \$5,300 assessed, and you apply the tax against the \$5,300.

Most families have that one special item, maybe Grandma's wedding ring, right, that they want to pass on to the youngest daughter, perhaps, and get it reset.

Mr. DELAY. Yet under all the discussion of tax fairness on this floor, very little was said that someone of middle income or even low income would end up one day possibly paying this tax that was intended to be put on the rich. Tax fairness, to the liberal Democrats, I mean, they are saying one thing and doing another, and that boggles my mind.

Mr. ARMEY. That is absolutely right. They did not say the 250 working people in Wichita, KS, were going to lose their job either, and now when we discover that they lost their job and we go to the joint tax committee and we say what has been the real impact, they say, "Well, our rules by which we evaluate the impact of this tax policy do not allow us to take into consideration these 250 lost jobs," and we say, "Well, we know the people are there that have lost their jobs." "Well, that may be true, but we do not count that."

Mr. WALKER. Well, what about the \$77 million in lost sales?

Mr. ARMEY. We do not count that.

Mr. WALKER. What about the \$1.5 million in lost revenues to the Government?

Mr. ARMEY. We do not count that.  
 Mr. DELAY. What about the \$700,000 in lost income tax to the Government?  
 Mr. ARMEY. We do not count that.  
 Mr. MCEWEN. Who establishes what we count and do not count?

Mr. ARMEY. The determination of what is counted and what is not counted is, of course, by the Democrat leadership of the Congress.

Mr. MCEWEN. So they write the rules so they win, and so any common sense would dictate to us that you are losing the jobs, that you are losing the revenues, you are losing the income, and yet in order to accomplish their goal of taxing the American people more, you are not allowed to count what you are losing, you are only allowed to count the little minuscule that might come in, and before you repeat that, in order to save these millions of dollars that are being lost and putting people back to work, because the Democrats write the rules.

I serve on the Committee on Rules. There are 13 members. The ratio is two to one plus one. There are four Republicans, two to one is eight, plus one is nine, nine to four. Those are the ones who write the rules of the House, and so they write the rules, so that under no circumstances can we bring in the fact that people are losing their jobs, and the Government is losing revenue, and that it would be advantageous to America and the national deficit and the American people if we were to lower the taxes on this luxury tax and people could go back and buy the little boat or keep the rings, and in order to accomplish their task, we are excluded because Democrats who control the Congress and have throughout your lifetime and mine and have for 56 of the last 60 years, they write the rules so that they win and their goal is to have more taxes and more spending.

When we were able to override them only twice since 1952, and once was in the 1981 example that I used when we were able to accomplish that, and we were able to bring all the new revenues, because we were not able to have that head-to-head confrontation and win by one vote in 1981 to get the country going, year after year after year, they said that those tax cuts obviously created a deficit.

The truth is that from 1981 to 1990, the revenues were coming in at an increase of 7 percent more than the year before, every year bringing 7 percent more, 7 percent more, 7 percent more. But the Democrats that chair every committee, every committee, every committee, and a Republican is not permitted to chair a committee. A Republican is not allowed to chair a committee in the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. ARMEY. Not only the Democrats control all the committees and they control the rules and they vote in their rules, the first vote that we take in the

convening of a new Congress, but they hire the research staff for the Joint Tax Committee.

Mr. MCEWEN. To write the reports the way they want them written. They hire who testifies before committees so they will say what they want to have said, and subsequently, when they write the spending bills and give them to the President, instead of passing them on a regular basis so he could deal with them one by one and either veto or sign, they put them all in a big stack at the end of the year and they shove it over at either Ronald Reagan or whoever and say, "Sign it or we shut down the Government. Social Security recipients do not get their check. The Government does not man the defense of the coasts and all the rest," and so they have to sign the whole thing, and they have a 9-percent increase in spending.

When you have a 7-percent increase in revenues and a 9-percent increase in spending, it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out what the problem is. Yet, they turn around and blame the President, Ronald Reagan or George Bush, for the spending that the Congress does when it is not all that difficult. Spending is up 9 percent, and anybody on a city council, anybody in their own checkbook, anybody in State government all know what the problem is when revenues are up 7, then you cannot increase spending any more than 7, but the Democrat Congress increases spending by 9 percent. Then who do they turn around and point to? They say that it obviously has to be Ronald Reagan's fault that we were spending more money than came in so that the deficit has to be his fault.

The President cannot spend a dime. The Congress can spend a dime only. The President cannot turn a key to the White House or turn on the lights unless Congress appropriates the money. Congress decides how much is spent, and they have created the deficit, because they write the rules the way they want.

Mr. ARMEY. Let me give two concrete examples.

If we went in any university in America today in any finance department or any economics department, indeed, I should guess even in any political science department and we had a youngster who said, "I want to do a master's thesis and consider the economic impact of the excise taxes, the luxury taxes in the 1990 budget summit agreement; 6 months later, I want to see what has been the economic impact," and that student brought that study back and he had excluded from his study any information about the number of people who lose their jobs, the decrease in sales of the items against which the taxes were applied, the decrease in the tax revenues from the decreased sales and the decreased jobs and had included only the direct

revenue receipts from the application of that tax alone, his thesis committee, even in a political science department, let alone a finance or economics department, would have rejected his thesis.

If, in fact, the Congressional Budget Office were to bring such a study to the Congress and present it to the majority in Congress, the Democrat majority in Congress, if they included the job loss, the income tax loss from the job loss, the sales loss and the taxes lost from the sales loss, if they included these things, the Democrat leadership would say, "Take that back. We will not accept that study. You must confine it only to the direct revenue receipts."

They have written, what I am saying, a methodological requirement that only allows the methodological gun to shoot to the left in the favor of more spending and more taxes.

One other point, a real live point: several years ago, 2 or 3 years ago, this Congress was considering the increase in the minimum wage. Under a piece of legislation called the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, passed by Senator Humphrey when he was here, and former Congressman Gus Hawkins from California, it is required by the law when considering such legislation that the Congressional Budget Office produce a study that reports the economic impact of the law.

When the Congressional Budget Office brought back a study fairly comprehensive using the best of their skills that examined the economic impact of an increase in the minimum wage, and they reported that the projected increase in the minimum wage would result in the loss of 250,000 jobs, Chairman Hawkins, who had written the law that mandated the study be done, refused to accept the study until they took it back and deleted the section about the job loss, so that, in effect, he said, "I will only accept a study of the economic impact of legislation that precludes any discussion of the impact on employment for working men and women in this country."

□ 2140

Now, how do we do a job of a study of economic impact when we refuse to accept any consideration of what happens to people's real opportunity to work?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, all this boils down to what the gentleman from Ohio was referring to, and I think the gentleman from Texas who understands this probably as well or better than any Member in this House, or even in the Senate. What this boils down to is that the American people will have to start asking themselves, rather than listening to less than the truth that is expounded on this floor by the liberal Democrats of this House, about the facts of what our economy has done over the 1980's in Ronald Reagan, and George Bush's con-



tribution to those accomplishments, they have to ask themselves, what would the economy be today if there weren't a Democrat Congress fighting President Reagan every step of the way, pulling things like Chairman Hawkins pulled, about taking a study that he mandated be done, that did not come out the way that he wanted it to come out, and refusing to accept that study. These kinds of things go on in this House and in committee rooms of this House every day, all day long.

It is amazing to me why in America, that has freedom of the press, how the press cannot pick up on the corruption of this Congress, of corrupting ideals, corrupting the truth that is conveyed back to the American people. The American people are swallowing this. It is amazing, that just recently we are going to have a tremendous debate that points out what we are talking about here, having to do with the recent Supreme Court decision on title 10 family planning funds. It has nothing to do with the first amendment.

What the U.S. Supreme Court basically has said is we cannot use Federal funds to counsel people on abortion. It had nothing to do with gagging the physicians in their ability to counsel with their patient. It had nothing to do with that, yet that is the debate that is being perpetrated by the liberal Democrats on the floor. It is called the gag rule. The debate is around the first amendment, not around Federal funds being used in title 10 family planning funds. It has nothing to do with the truth of the matter, and the truth of the issue.

The same is happening under the guise of tax fairness, happening day in and day out in this body. For those that may have just tuned in, I have to remind them that we are down here talking about real tax fairness. Tax fairness that adheres to real economic theory. That economic theory of practice and reality that responds to certain activities taken on by this Government.

If I may take a short minute of the gentleman's time to reiterate some of the things, and the gentleman will be proud of this. I will be referring to a study from a group that if I remember correctly is a group that the gentleman put together, the Center for Tax Policies at the National Center for Policy Analysis in Dallas, TX. I think the gentleman from Texas formed this group.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, I did not form that group. It is a very good group formed by a man named John Goodman.

Mr. DELAY. I knew the gentleman was very involved in this group, and especially with a husband-and-wife team by the name of Aldona and Gary Robbins who have done some excellent studies that reflect realism in economics, and the real results of actions

taken by this House, not the myths that are perpetrated by this House.

I refer to a study they did dated March of 1991, called Tax Fairness Myths and Reality. If the gentleman will bear with me, I want to reiterate why we are here tonight, so we understand what we are talking about.

I would like to take this myth by myth. This will not take long. Myth by myth perpetrated by the liberal Democrats and have been doing so, almost daily, on the floor of this House for over a year. That is why we came down to the floor of this House to try to dispel some of these myths. We are bombarded with a myth, for instance, that we talked about earlier, but during a myth that was perpetrated during the 1980's, that the rich got richer and the poor got poorer, when in fact, over the past decade, the real per capita income of Americans grew by 21.2 percent, and every income class posted a substantial increase in real after-tax income as reflected by the charts in the discussion here tonight.

There are other myths we have not touched on including the myth that is perpetrated by the liberal Democrats on the floor of this House for a year that the top 10 percent of income earners gained from the tax cut of the Reagan era while the bottom 90 percent lost, when in fact the facts are that total taxes as a percent of gross national product today are slightly higher than they were in 1980. The Nation's total tax burden, therefore, did not go down, in large part because of Social Security payroll tax increases that took effect in the 1980's, passed in 1977 by the Carter administration, but were legislated. The Reagan income tax cuts, however, lowered the personal income tax burden for every income tax class.

Another myth perpetrated on the floor of this House by the liberal Democrats of this House, the Reagan tax cuts were a give away to the rich, when in fact the tax rate on the highest income earners was reduced sharply during the 1980's in order to encourage wealthy taxpayers to earn more income and pay more taxes.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield on that point, this is a very interesting point, and the one great myth that we have as a result of the Reagan tax cuts of the 1980's, the argument is that the wealthy do not pay their fair share.

I would just like to point out one fascinating statistic that we turned up here, that from the time of 1981 to 1988, the average tax paid by the top 1 percent incomer, we are talking about the people in the top 1 percent of the income category in America, the average tax that they paid was \$118 for I guess the average dollar of taxes paid by people in the bottom half of the income category in 1981.

Now, in 1988, that ratio went from \$118 to \$240 to every \$1. That is to say

in 1988, if a person was in the top income category, their average tax was \$240 for every dollar paid by any person, by the average taxpayer in the bottom half of the Tax Code. That is over a 50 percent increase, so that in fact, the share of taxes paid by the rich increased.

Not only did they pay their fair share, but more so in 1988 than they did in 1981.

Now, couple that with the fact that the average family got an annual tax savings of \$1,500 a year from the tax cuts that are known as the Reagan tax cuts, so the gentleman and I got our benefits, got our savings. My daughter, who is a bottom-level managerial position, entry-level person, got her tax break. My brother, who lives out in the Dakotas, who has an average family income, got his tax break. But the wealthy folks had their share of the tax, relative to the average person in the bottom half of the income spectrum, increased by 50 percent, just the opposite of this myth that the gentleman was saying.

Mr. DELAY. Another myth dispelled.

There is another myth perpetrated on the floor of this House that the Reagan tax reform was unfair to low-income families, when in fact, as pointed out by the Robbinses, for the vast majority of Americans, the greatest benefit from the Reagan tax reform is not that tax payments are lower, but that taxes are lower than they would otherwise have been.

They show on the chart, and I think this is so telling, the only way we can determine who is right in this argument is to look at taxes today relative to taxes that would be today if we had not had the Reagan tax reform and the Reagan tax cuts.

Now, if we took 1980 tax law, I want to point out a couple of glaring examples. The 1980 tax law, if we take that and apply it to today's income and compare it to taxes today, a family earning \$10,000 under the 1980 tax law would be paying taxes of \$863, where today in actuality they are paying \$369, a difference of 134 percent.

□ 2150

I go further to say that an average income for a family, let us just pick out \$45,000 a year, if the 1980 tax law were to apply today, that family making \$45,000 a year would pay \$9,596, as compared to today's taxes of \$5,186, or they would be paying 88 percent more in taxes today if we were still living under the 1980 law, where if you go down to someone who is "the rich" you have the rich paying, let us say a family that makes \$1,700,000 a year, under the 1980 law they would be paying \$635,000, yet under today's law they pay \$391,900 a difference of only 62 percent. So you can see that the lower income under the 1980 law would be paying a higher percent taxes than they are pay-

ing today than the wealthier families today. The wealthier families today, indeed total tax payments are higher and their share of tax payments are certainly higher, another myth dispelled.

A couple more myths. Myth perpetrated on the floor of this House: The income tax system became less progressive during 1980's.

The fact is, the U.S. tax system became more progressive, not less so. Between 1979 and 1988 the share of income taxes paid by the top 5 percent of income earners rose from about 38 percent to 46 percent. Between 1981 and 1988, the share of Social Security payroll taxes paid by the top percent of income earners rose from 11 percent to 12 percent. By contrast, the bottom half of income earners now pay only 5.5 percent of Federal income taxes and only 17 percent of Social Security payroll taxes.

Myth perpetrated on the floor of this House: During the 1980's, income of the wealthy grew faster than that of any other group. No one really knows if that statement is true. It is certainly true of income subject to taxes, but there is no hard evidence that the total income of the wealthy grew faster than that of any other taxpayers. We do not know how much of the growth in taxable income was due to a shift from nontaxable to taxable income and how much to the fact that the wealthy worked harder or invested more to produce more income.

Myth perpetrated on the floor of this House by the liberal Democrats: The rich pay a smaller percentage of their income in taxes today than they did in 1980, although most taxpayers pay a higher percent. No one knows exactly what the income of the rich was in 1980. Official records show only income subject to the income tax. Taxpayers were not required to report income from tax-exempt securities, for instance, or other forms of tax-sheltered income. Because of Reagan tax reform, though, much more of the income of the wealthy today is taxable and much less is sheltered; but by any reasonable estimate of total income in 1980 and 1990, taxes as a percent of income have gone up, not down, for the wealthiest taxpayers.

The last myth perpetrated on the floor of this House by the liberal Democrats of this House: The tax system can be made more progressive by raising taxes paid by the rich. We have talked extensively here for over an hour about this particular myth. For most of the history of the income tax, the opposite has been true. That is, whenever the highest tax rate has been increased, the total tax payments and share of tax payments made by the rich has gone down. Whenever the highest tax rate has been lowered, the share of taxes paid by the rich has gone up. That is the experience of the 1980's,

replicated by this historical relationship. That is history. That is history documented by the IRS and many other economists.

I just say that we deal with these myths all the time and they are very difficult to deal with under the present rules of the House. I hope the American people will see the difficulty under which we operate in this House in trying to bring the truth to the American people. One day the American people are going to wake up and understand that government is not their friend, that government indeed is necessary to keep order in this country and defend the weak, but government is not their friend. Government services usually hurt more than they help, and certainly taxes are that way.

Mr. Speaker, I see our distinguished Whip of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], has returned, and I am sure the gentleman has some words of wisdom for us, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know about wisdom, but first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for having developed this idea and having organized this, because without the gentleman's leadership we would not be here tonight. I want to thank both my friends from Texas.

I think the gentleman is putting his finger on what is in some ways the most frustrating thing about serving in Congress. The gentleman was a businessman and he knows the hard way that if you did not actually close a sale and get in the check and clear it at the bank and pay your employees, you would go out of business. In business you have sort of a real driving force to face reality.

We are in a building dominated by lawyers, who understand that reality is when you convince the jury to believe, and if they can get away with the next final appeal, then they get on to file the next case. The difference in the whole structure is just very radical and it takes a while to get used to. Then, of course, our good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the ranking Republican on the Joint Economic Committee, is faced with the whole challenge of the fact that the entire bureaucratic structure of the Congress is geared to an intellectual idea that is at least 30 years out of date and which literally rejects reality, so if you walk in and you say, "Here is what is really happening, you know, we are in a recession," they say, "Well, we are not sure, because our computer does not show that."

You say, "You are going to lose money and put people out of work." They say, "Well, that is not in our computer."

It is like going to a doctor who says, "I don't care how much pain you are in, you are not allowed to have a heart attack because my particular piece of

equipment does not show it," and you are laying on the table and you say, "Wait a second. I am in real trouble." You would change doctors.

Instead, we find ourselves recently, and I do not mean this in any sense as a personal comment about an individual, but more as a comment about reality, the Joint Tax Committee has now brought in a new leader who is a Jimmy Carter Treasury executive. Well, if you look at the history as we have been talking about it tonight of 4 years under Carter and you say, "You know, what would that kind of person tend to do intellectually?"

They happen to believe, I think with great sincerity, they happen to believe in ideas which are simply wrong. They do not work.

It is ironic to me, and I started to say this at other times, so I do appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, all across Eastern Europe we are saying to Poland, to Hungary, to Russia, to Lithuania, to Latvia, to Estonia, "Go to private property. Get rid of your bureaucracies. Shrink your government. Decentralize. Have a market system. Use incentives. Encourage people to work. Encourage people to save."

And then what are we doing in Washington? Creating more bureaucracy, creating more redtape, raising taxes, everything the opposite of what we are telling people in Eastern Europe.

I find it fascinating that our good friends in the Deomocratic Party belong to the Ligachov wing of the world, that at a time when we belong to the Yeltsin wing and we are part of that broad movement toward human freedom, many of our dear friends on the left are wedded to an idea of higher taxes, more bureaucracy, centralized government, less private property, less incentives, and in fact it is a true story, a friend of mine was at a dinner party with a Russian who was in fact traveling at the time with Shevardnadze. The Russian asked one of the hosts, "What is the real difference between your two parties?"

And the host said, "Well, the Democrats believe in taxing people who are productive and prosperous and successful at a higher rate, and the Republicans believe in encouraging people to create jobs, encouraging people to create more prosperity."

The man looked at him and he said, "Ah, you mean your Democrats are like our Communists. They believe in taking away from those who have, giving to those who do not. They believe in stifling free enterprise, stifling initiative."

I do not mean this in any sense in the old-fashioned Red baiting, but in the genuinely intellectually honest argument that if you watch Mayor Dinkins wrestle with New York City's problems and you watch the reform leader of Leningrad, now to become St. Petersburg, and the reform leader of Moscow,



the reform leaders of Moscow and Leningard would be on the floor with the three of us talking about how you shrink government and you open up the private sector and encourage small business, and our friend, David Dinkins, nice man, wedded to the process of 50 years ago, would be saying, "Oh, you couldn't do that to my city, bring free enterprise to New York, privatize the social services, cut down the bureaucracy, offend the municipal unions. We couldn't do that. What we have to do is raise taxes."

And so I just hope people as they watch this with us will understand, we are in a very real debate in this city between people who understand reality and people who are wedded to a theory which is dead.

□ 2200

And I think these two gentlemen are playing a very, very important role in making that debate possible on behalf of the American people and on behalf of the country's future.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to come back for a minute and say "thank you" to these two gentlemen.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the whip because the whip is struggling under the system, to try to make some sense out of it. Not only that, he is trying to hold the Republicans together and to elect even more Republicans so that this House will be controlled by the Republicans and we can institute those real ideas that come from real experiences from the real world that have real effects on creating equal opportunity.

The whip is one of the most distinguished leaders of this Congress who works, obviously, very, very, very hard. Here it is 10 in Washington tonight, and here is the leader, the No. 2 man in the Republican Conference, down here on the floor telling the truth about tax fairness and what it really means to our country. As I said earlier, one day the American people are going to wake up and understand that realism and private property and all the things the gentleman listed are important and the more we go towards the Soviet Union the worse off everyone is. Unless this whip has something else to say, I would just love to give the opportunity to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the opportunity to close these special orders because he is an economics professor who understands real economics, free market economics and how they affect this country and what Government's effect on this country is, and especially the effects of what the liberal Democrats call tax fairness will have on the American people's ability to accomplish their dreams, raise their families and turn over a world to their children better than they found it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a very good debate. There have been so many facts and figures put out today, and one of the things that worries me is that facts simply, so often, do not turn the debate in Congress. Let me talk in more general terms.

This whole taxpayer fairness debate that we see raging in Washington is really, I think, a reflection of two different visions by two different political parties, the great Republican Party that believes in the great promise of the United States of America throughout all its founding documents and throughout all the best dreams and hopes of its founding fathers, that we would have a Nation that would both have the commitment and the capacity to guarantee equality of opportunity to all its citizens and that the policies of the Federal Government should be directed toward assuring that equality of opportunity.

Now, the way that plays out in the ordinary life of the average person is for an economy that is robust, vibrant, that has vitality and the ability to change and adjust to changing technologies, changing times and to grow so that each new person who enters the work force or leaves college, leaves high school or emigrates to this country from another nation where their lives are more forsaken, would see that opportunity "for me to build for myself and my family a place in the sun in a period of time when things are going higher for all people."

Now, on the other hand the once great and proud Democratic Party has slid into a misperception, one, of the ability, the capability of the democratic free enterprise system as we have seen it work in the United States. I remember seeing this play out in what we now call the days of national malaise, when even the President of the United States became so discouraged with the futility of their policy efforts to turn around the terrible circumstances of both unemployment and inflation, that the new book that came out for the left wing of American politics, that became the book around which they attached their perception of America and what the Government must do in America, was a book entitled "The Zero-Sum Game," by a man named Lester Thurow, from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The thesis of the book was that growth was no longer possible for the American economy, and since growth was no longer possible for the American economy, we have come to the end of history. God had died, and there was no chance for any of us to see economic growth ever again in this Nation.

And since growth was no longer possible, then the only thing left for the Government to do, and the Government must do something, within the

context of the zero-sum game, is to redistribute income. And it is that point at which that political party most lacking in understanding of the capability and abilities of the American people, most lacking in faith in the institutions and the mores and the cultural patterns that brought us so far at least, in the words of Darryl Royal, "willing to dance with them that brung 'em," and most willing to throw up their hands in despair and most willing to grab the moment for them to increase their power over the lives of the citizens.

Then they hit on the idea that we must use the tax policies of America to redistribute income. And of course as you see in the years of the Carter administration, all these redistributive policies made things worse and worse and worse and worse. And then came Ronald Reagan, who said, "No, America can grow. What we used to know in the old days as a practical American genius is really there, really alive, and it really will work again if we can just get the Government out of the way of the American people so that it can work."

Well, we saw it work. What happened was that Ronald Reagan proved in 10 years that freedom works and it works for everybody. The economy can grow, we can generate and create jobs. We have had a discussion about that. Increased opportunities can be more available for all people, and we can fulfill our historic promise of increased equal opportunity for all Americans.

Now, this has been a very discouraging lesson to the left wing of American politics, because if in fact the vision of the right works and people are made made better off by being made more free with less Government, lower taxes, some efforts to restrain Government spending, then their political message is dead.

So what we see now is sort of a death struggle of a failed vision trying to reassert through every feeble effort which was necessary even to rigging the numbers, denying the facts, putting together mathematical and statistical and econometric and methodologic apparatus that are intellectually defunct so as to be an embarrassment to anybody that would be intellectually honest about it, trying to recapture their one great moment when growth could not happen. Therefore, their redistribution was necessary.

It reminds me of an observation or two by an old professor, Prof. Paul N. Rosenthein-Rodan when he said, "Beware of politicians who manufacture data for the sake of testimony." And then when he later admonished me to understand that there was nothing more arrogant and abusive than a self-righteous income redistributor.

And it is that tension for that self-righteous redistribution of income, in

fact in the real interest of maintaining "my power," "my control," "my position in the process," that is governing this fairness doctrine. We ought not to be talking about what are fair taxation methods; we ought to be talking about what taxation methods can we use to fund that minimum necessary activity of the Federal Government on behalf of the American people in such a way as to generate the least disincentive to growth, prosperity and freedom for all Americans through all times in the future.

We ought to be talking about what kind of a tax system can we put into place that will give our children more freedom, more dignity, more opportunity and more prosperity than we had; not that which will redistribute less freedom, less prosperity and less opportunity among more contentious, unhappy citizens.

So the question is: Is America a Nation that redistributes or is it a Nation that prospers? That is the choice we have. I would be very wary of anybody who wanted to enter a serious policy discussion by focusing on what is fair rather than what is productive for the American people.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 2210

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] for such an eloquent presentation, and, as always, the gentleman understands what drives this economy and understands that government does not drive this economy. It drags it down. And I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] in the chair who has been putting up with this 2 hours of special orders, and all I can say to this House and to the American people is: Stay tuned. There is more to come.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the special order of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ESPY]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### REMEMBERING HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota. [Mr. OBERSTAR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, had Hubert Horatio Humphrey not left us 13 years ago, he would be 80 years old this year, and, health permitting, still working, on behalf of the poor, the worker, the underrepresented people of this country. Still working, still smiling, and still enthusiastic.

No elected official from Minnesota can help but be touched by Senator Humphrey's life and legacy. People of every political stripe across this country can agree or disagree with his views, as they see fit, but they cannot ignore them.

Senator Humphrey believed in America, and all that is good in Americans. He was an optimist, an idealist, a visionary. He was a fighter for the betterment of the human condition, and he kept right on fighting to the end.

Even in the twilight of his life, as the curtain of death drew closer and closer, he retained his optimism, his idealism . . . and that eternal smile. At his farewell address, in this very Chamber, he said:

I have been known in my life to be an optimist, some people say a foolish optimist, and I suppose at times I have ignored reality and had more than the usual degree of optimism. But I said to the critics that I am optimistic about America, and that I rebuke their cynicism.

The reason I do is because history is on my side. We have come a long way in this country. More people today are enjoying more of what we call, at least in the material sense, the good things of life in every form. We have made fantastic strides in science, technology, and engineering. Our agriculture is a wonderful world, but most significantly, we are a heterogeneous population, and we are trying to demonstrate to the world what is the great moral message of the Old and New Testament: namely, that people can live together in peace and in understanding, because really that is the challenge, that is what peace is all about.

It is not a question of whether we pile up more wealth; it is a question of whether or not we can live together, different races, different creeds, different cultures, different areas, not as a homogeneous people but rather in the pluralistic society where we respect each other, hopefully try to understand each other, and then have a common bond of devotion to the Republic.

Come, let us reason together. There are no problems between the different points of view . . . that cannot be reconciled, if we are willing to give a little and to share a little and not expect it all to be our way. Who is there who has such wisdom that he knows what he says is right? I think we have to give some credence to the fact that majority rule, which requires the building of an understanding, and the sharing, at times the compromising, is the best of all forms of rule.

We are all children of one God. We live on a very small planet, but so far as we know, it is the only planet that sustains life. Therefore, apparently we have been selected for an unusual and a special purpose. I believe that purpose is to try to demonstrate that the power of understanding and reason and love can prevail.

It is not easy, and there are many times we want to give up, but you have to have spirit. You have to have faith. There are times when we lose faith in the institutions of our government as we almost did. We all do; but, dear friends, it was restored.

Individually, we must be strong. We must be strong in our commitment to human freedom and justice. We must be strong in our commitment to opportunity and equal opportunity. We must be strong in our commitment to the care of the needy and the sick and the handicapped and in the maintenance of an economic system and a political system that will make it possible for us to care for those who are less fortunate. It all goes together.

Mr. Speaker, as we in Congress go about the business of government, we should occasionally pause and remember the legacy of Hubert Humphrey, but most of all, we should pause, remember and reflect upon these words: "We must be strong in our commitment to the care of the needy and the sick and the handicapped and in the maintenance of an economic system and a political system that will make it possible for us to care for those who are less fortunate. It all goes together."

It does, indeed, my colleagues. Come, let us reason together . . . and honor Hubert Humphrey, who called us all to a life of reasoned service to humanity.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the anniversary of the birth of one of our greatest Americans and leaders in the Congress and this Nation, Hubert Horatio Humphrey.

Hubert Humphrey, Mr. Speaker, was one of a kind, and America and the world still misses him greatly.

A leader with vision and enthusiasm, energy, and conviction, Hubert Humphrey's life stood for all that is great about America; caring for our neighbors at home and our fellow humans wherever they are; compassion for the less fortunate among us, and the belief that government and people can work together to make life better for all.

Hubert Humphrey gave his life to public service, serving for a total of 33 years in public office as mayor of Minneapolis, MN, U.S. Senator from Minnesota for a total of 19 years, Vice President of the United States for 4 years, and Democratic candidate for President of the United States. He continued in public office until his death in 1978.

HHH, as he was often known, stood foursquare for what he believed in, when it was popular and when it was unpopular, and fought for justice for all. He had the courage to speak for equal rights for all Americans, regardless of race, as early as 1948, and stood as a beacon for American justice and freedom at home and around the world.

Hubert Humphrey was known to all as "the Happy Warrior," and no better nickname has described such a beloved public figure, for Hubert Humphrey loved people, loved politics, and loved doing good. Nothing got him down, and he remained a devoted and loving fighter for the good causes from the day he entered politics to his last breath.

I clearly remember, Mr. Speaker, when Hubert Humphrey was being treated for cancer in the year before his death, the stories of how even then he worked to cheer up the lives of his fellow patients in the hospital, plying the corridors with gusto and refusing to let these ill people feel bad—despite the fact that he was dying himself.

Mr. Speaker, as a young Democrat in the 1960's, I was honored to have the opportunity to meet Vice President Humphrey on a number of occasions. He was an inspiration to all those who had that opportunity, a model and guide for all of us who are and wish to be involved in government and public service.

Mr. Speaker, Hubert Humphrey was a leader like no other, and his loss is felt every day



in this city and around the world. I am honored to join my colleagues in marking the life and the accomplishments of Hubert Horatio Humphrey.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in remembering the great American and Minnesotan, Hubert H. Humphrey.

What stands out in my own memories of Hubert Humphrey is the vitality of the man. I was privileged to hear him speak and to be with him on numerous occasions. He would literally radiate hope and joy, love and compassion, strength and energy.

For nearly all of my life, Hubert Humphrey represented me in his capacity as mayor, Senator, and Vice President. He did his job so well that I do not recall having to write, to phone, or to remind him of my views and the special concerns of Minnesota. In fact, Hubert H. Humphrey was so attentive to people, he was so much in tune that he was able to anticipate and to articulate, to inspire and to lead for the individual citizen and for the Nation.

Of course, Hubert represented more than just me but the qualities that I have noted were felt by Minnesotans and most Americans as his work and efforts touched the issues of the day and our lives. That surely is why even today the affection and respect for Hubert H. Humphrey persists among the working men and women of our Nation, the people that experience discrimination or face special challenges. Hubert H. Humphrey was on their side, committed heart and soul to their cause.

It is indeed the nature of the Humphrey service to people that inspired hope yesterday, today and tomorrow in the ability of our government and public servants to help people and to make a difference then and now.

After I was first elected to Congress in 1976, I had the opportunity to work first hand with Senator Humphrey. Those 13 months were his last in Congress and for much of the time he was ill. However, the physical pain that he endured did not distract from his work nor from his commitment to the poor, the elderly and the children.

During his last term, Hubert Humphrey used his position as a senior statesman to counsel Congress and the Carter administration on behalf of the poor and downtrodden.

In preparing for this special order, I reviewed the tributes that were paid to Senator Humphrey in January 1978, following his death. The comments contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during that month and the editorials commemorating his life and accomplishments were bipartisan, admiring, and warm in affection. Hubert's life and the politics of joy were reciprocated by the love and affection of Democrats and Republicans alike, by the rich and poor and by whites, blacks, and Hispanics.

It is appropriate for us to consider the work and philosophy of Hubert Humphrey in this day and age.

At a time when the threat of quotas and Willie Horton are used to undermine 20 years of civil rights policies, it is important to remember Humphrey's challenge to the 1948 Democratic Convention and to the Nation to step "out of the shadow of States rights and into the bright sunshine of human rights."

At a time when campaigns are run on smears and innuendo, it is important to re-

member the Happy Warrior's philosophy of the politics of joy.

At a time when an administration encourages big business mergers and takeover mania regardless of the cost, it is important to remember Humphrey's families, farmers, workers, and small businesses.

At a time when we hear that the National Government cannot do anything for the people and that a budget agreement ties our hands, it is important to remember a man who thought that the government could and morally must act.

It is incumbent upon us all to remember Hubert Humphrey's words:

The moral test of government is how it treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have known and worked with Hubert H. Humphrey. His life and his death are a commemoration of how great man can be and how we can serve the common good. His life, philosophy, and accomplishments cannot be summed up in a few words. That is just too much there. However, I believe that the late Adlai Stevenson came close when he said:

He rejoices in what we are; he is keenly aware of what we are not; and is deeply committed to what we must become.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating Hubert H. Humphrey and his 33 years of service to this great country.

I had the privilege to know and serve with Hubert Humphrey. When I arrived in Washington in 1965, Hubert had already served 16 years in the Senate and was beginning his term as Vice President in the Johnson administration.

Hubert was my kind of Democrat. He described himself as "an active, working, progressive, liberal Democrat" and a "Roosevelt Democrat." The first bill he introduced was for a compulsory national health-insurance system under Social Security. His entire career was spent fighting for programs to end poverty, to provide housing and jobs, and improve the quality of life for all Americans.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I was most familiar with Hubert's contribution to the education of our children and his support for the rights of working Americans.

Hubert believed that every American child had a right to a quality education and voted for Federal aid to colleges, universities, and local school systems. Hubert's recommendation for early childhood education for those needing it was incorporated into the successful Head Start Program.

Hubert was also a friend to American workers. Among other things, he supported broadening the coverage and increasing the minimum pay under the Federal Wage-Hour Act, and extending the payment period for unemployment benefits. In 1960, Hubert stated:

It is clear that the greatest hope for eliminating poverty is regular employment at decent wages for America's wage earners \* \* \* It means making it easier—not harder—for unions to organize the unorganized, and bring them the economic benefits of collective bargaining.

I campaigned for Hubert in his 1968 bid for the Presidency. Campaigning for Hubert was one of the most rewarding political experiences of my life. Words cannot describe my disappointment over his narrow defeat in the election. My only consolation was that Hubert won big in my home State of Michigan.

I know that Hubert would not approve of my brooding over what might have been had he won the election. He never allowed friends or family to dwell on the past. He always encouraged us to look to the future, to live life to the fullest. It is hard to not long for the day when we had leaders like Hubert Humphrey at the helm.

Mr. Speaker, Hubert and I worked well together in both our political and legislative duties and I was proud to be his friend. He was in my opinion one of the most decent and humane people that I have had the privilege of knowing.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, Hubert Humphrey entered the Minnesota scene in the 1930's. It's safe to say that Minnesota and the rest of the country have not been the same since.

From his days as a college instructor, radio commentator, and mayor of Minneapolis, to his years as a U.S. Senator and Vice President of the United States, the thoughts, words, and deeds of Hubert Humphrey have left an indelible impression on the people and the public servants of this country. He'll be leaving an impression for generations to come.

We called him the Happy Warrior. I like to think it was because while he fought long and hard for the things he believed in, he never forgot that ultimately, we are all in this together. For Hubert, it was never "us" against "them." Rather, it was always a matter of working together to do what was best for all Americans. And, while he could disagree ferociously and fight passionately, his ability to put aside differences and pitch in to do the right thing meant that even in defeat, Hubert was victorious.

His lifetime of public service has left Minnesota and the rest of the country a legacy characterized by courage, integrity, and commitment. Courage because he fought for many things, civil rights among them, long before most were willing to take up the battle. Integrity and commitment because he continued to fight for the things he believed in throughout his career and his life, regardless of where the political winds of the day may have been blowing.

The world has been without Hubert Humphrey for 13 years now. But even in death, Hubert has been victorious. For public servants and concerned citizens across the country, Hubert Humphrey lives on as a shining example of what one person with dedication and commitment can do to improve the world.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues in commemorating the 80th anniversary of Hubert H. Humphrey's birth. The "Happy Warrior" dedicated his life to public service and our Nation will remain eternally grateful for this decision.

I first met Hubert Humphrey as a student at Louisiana State University. The great Minnesotan was my instructor of American political science during my senior year of college. Not only did I have the good fortune of study-

ing under Hubert Humphrey, I was able to meet with him many times during my later political career.

Hubert Humphrey served as Vice President of the United States under President Lyndon Johnson from January 20, 1965, until January 20, 1969. On a few occasions during this period I enjoyed Hubert's humor and insights as we traveled to events on Air Force Two.

Hubert Humphrey, of course, is best known as one of the greatest political minds in American history. What is not as well known, however, is that he also excelled in other professions including pharmacist and educator. Hubert graduated from Denver College of Pharmacy in 1933 and the University of Minnesota in 1939. After earning a graduate degree from the University of Louisiana in 1939, he began his long, varied, and distinguished career.

The pinnacle of that career, of course, brought Hubert to the Vice Presidency of the United States. Although this was an extremely trying period in American history, he brought to the office a background and knowledge which was invaluable to President Johnson in making difficult determinations. Even after leaving the office of Vice President, Hubert continued to provide input to our Nation's leaders until his death in 1978.

The United States is undoubtedly a better place due to the efforts of Vice President Hubert Humphrey. His humanity and compassion brought a new level of dignity to the American political world. I call upon my colleagues in Congress to use this anniversary of his birth to rededicate ourselves to Hubert's values and commitment.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, Hubert Humphrey loved to tell about the time, after he'd delivered a particularly long, stem-winding speech, that his wife, Muriel, put her arm around him and whispered, "You know, dear, you don't have to be eternal to be immortal."

Hubert had trouble summarizing things—mainly because he knew so much—about so much. But in the spirit of Muriel's advice, let me suggest that two of the greatest lessons Humphrey taught us can each be boiled down to three words.

"Don't look back," and "Never give up."

After losing the 1972 Democratic Presidential nomination, he told a friend:

You know—you can spend your whole life worrying about all the things you should have done. But that's a waste of time. Instead, worry about all the things you're going to do.

Humphrey's first term in the U.S. Senate was pretty discouraging. He spoke on over 450 topics, introduced scores of bills, amendments, and resolutions, and didn't pass one of them.

His own Democratic majority leader called him a pipsqueak.

But Hubert never looked back. Never gave up. And that's a good thing.

Good thing for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Good thing for the Peace Corps.

Good thing for the Civil Rights bill, for the Job Corps, for Food for Peace, for National Defense Student Loans, and for the Space Program.

Good thing for every health-giving, kid-loving, tree-growing, peace-promoting, family-saving, forward-looking piece of legislation to

come down the pike in America for a quarter of a century.

Because Hubert Humphrey never gave up.

Shortly before he died, hollowed by cancer, Humphrey arrived for the last time at Twin Cities International Airport. He was stopped by a news reporter who asked if, in light of his illness, he was considering resigning from the Senate.

Hubert stood up a little straighter, looked the reporter in the eye, and said, "Resign? I'm not resigning from anything! In fact, my friend, I'm thinking about joining a few things!"

If he were here today, 80 years old and still looking ahead, Hubert Humphrey wouldn't be joining anything.

Humphrey would be leading the drive for a new Civil Rights bill—demanding that we join—challenging us again to "walk forthrightly into the sunlight of human rights"—not only in this country—but in terms of our actions around the world.

Humphrey would be leading the fight for the environment. And leading the battle to get the lead out of the air our kids breathe, the water they drink, and the ground they play on.

Humphrey would be leading every effort to afford the homeless, the helpless, the handicapped—women, minorities, kids, and seniors—the dignity and the opportunity they deserve—as Americans and children God.

He had a way of bringing us together. A way of reminding us that no matter what the issues that drive us apart in America, the great causes of humankind that bring us together—as a people and as a Nation—are so much more important.

The great legislators, Humphrey once said, are either mechanics or artists of public policy. The greatest legislators are both. Humphrey was both. The legislative mechanic who could remember every point and detail of every bill he ever passed. And the artist who made us lift our eyes off the sidewalks and look to the heavens and the stars above.

The Humphrey Forum at his living memorial is dedicated to his belief "that each of us can make a difference. That what is wrong can be made right. That people possess the basic wisdom and goodness to govern themselves without conflict."

So should we.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to a great American, Hubert H. Humphrey.

His career in the public sector spanned more than 33 years from his election as mayor of Minneapolis in 1945 to his death in 1978 while serving in the U.S. Senate. Hubert Humphrey was first elected to the Senate in 1948 and was reelected two successive times. During this period, he served as Democratic whip from 1961 through 1964.

In 1964, he left the Senate to become President Johnson's running-mate and was elected as Vice President—a post which he served well and with distinction. After his unsuccessful campaign for President in 1968, he returned to teaching political science at Macalester College and the University of Minnesota.

Fortunately for us, the people of Minnesota, and the rest of the Nation, Hubert Humphrey's retirement from public life was short and in 1971 he returned to the Senate where he served until his death in 1978.

Hubert Humphrey served this country well. He left a legacy of which we can all be proud and we can all strive to achieve. He was also a wonderfully warm, compassionate, and caring human being. I remember well his visit to Atlantic City on my behalf in 1976 when he attended one of my fundraisers. I will always remember the advice that he gave me on the flight there. He said, you know, Bill, we get caught up in politics and government and think that these are the most important things in our lives. I did and did not spend as much time with my family as I would have liked. Make sure your family always comes first and don't let this demanding job sap all your time and energy because you can never recapture those precious moments and milestones in the lives of your children.

I am very pleased that I am able to participate in this Special Order to honor such a great American who made immeasurable contributions to our Nation in this year of the 80th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 80th anniversary of the birth of Hubert Humphrey, the former Senator and Vice President from Minnesota who died in January 1978. As we pause today to reflect on his many accomplishments, I pray that Congress will continue to carry on the legacy of this great leader.

During his long career of public service, Hubert waged numerous political battles on behalf of his country. However, few if any aroused greater opposition than his struggle to make health insurance available to all of our senior citizens. As a freshman Senator in 1949, the first piece of legislation Hubert introduced was a bill authorizing health insurance for all of America's seniors, regardless of their income. The fight to make this dream a reality required another 16 years of effort before Congress established the Medicare program in 1965. The Medicare bill passed with the support of myself and other members of Congress who shared Hubert's commitment to seniors.

Hubert's support for Medicare and similar legislation was nurtured by the suffering he witnessed during the Great Depression. The Senator's personal experiences, including his father's struggle to keep a family pharmacy from going bankrupt, helped shape Hubert's political philosophy. In the early 1930's, Hubert interrupted his studies at the University of Minnesota to help his father cope with a desperate economic situation in South Dakota. While there, Hubert saw hundreds of unemployed workers whose hopes for a better life had scattered like dust over a wind-swept prairie.

By the time Hubert reached the Senate, he was determined to help working Americans cope with the kind of hardships he had seen during the Depression. He did this by pushing for workers' rights through legislative initiatives rooted in the tradition of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Hubert broadened his efforts to help workers across the globe by resisting the spread of communism in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. At the same time, however, he worked just as hard at trying to achieve a just peace with the Soviet Union. As a champion of arms-control efforts in the Senate, Hubert was a prime mover in the establishment of the Federal



Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the signing of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty by President John F. Kennedy.

Hubert's legislative proficiency earned him many political victories, including a term as Vice President in 1964 under President Lyndon B. Johnson. Nonetheless, Hubert's heartbreakingly narrow loss in the 1968 Presidential election didn't dampen his zeal for public service. Hubert returned to the Senate in 1971, where he held a leadership role for another 7 years.

In conclusion, Hubert's wit, knowledge and dedication to public service earned him the respect and admiration of both Democrats and Republicans. His bubbling enthusiasm and his genuine desire to help working Americans are sadly missed by those who knew him.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the life of an American who, through his years of public service, inspired so many. Hubert H. Humphrey stood and still stands as a shining example of what public life can and should be.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues in observing the 80th anniversary of Senator Humphrey's birth. The public life of this great man, spanning 33 years, made an indelible positive mark on the spirit of this nation.

When I think of Hubert Humphrey, I think of a man who was an unfailingly honest politician who did the very best he could to improve the world. He was a man of integrity, of compassion and of courage who fought hard for those who are least able to fight for themselves. And even when he lost, Hubert Humphrey kept on fighting.

One of my favorite quotes, used in a speech by Hubert Humphrey, epitomizes everything for which this man stood:

It was once said that the moral test of Government is how that Government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life—the sick, the needy and the handicapped.

Humphrey continued,

Let America judge itself on those standards, not on the stock market alone; not only on our gross national product, important as that is; not only on our material wealth, but rather on those great idealistic and spiritual values which sustain a nation and which brought this nation into being.

Hubert Humphrey, coming out of a proud and strong tradition of Minnesota populism, passed this moral test with flying colors. His concern and his work for the children, the elderly, the sick, the needy and the developmentally disabled, made a significant difference in the lives of countless people across this Nation.

As we search today as a nation for leadership and for solutions to our many pressing domestic problems, we can learn much from studying Hubert Humphrey's life. We can take inspiration from his commitment, his dedication, his perseverance, his true concern for the needs of the less-fortunate and his unceasing work in public service.

In whatever he did, he pursued excellence. We are fortunate as a people that what Hubert Humphrey chose to do was public service. In reaching for the stars, he improved the lives of many who lived in the shadows and set an example for all of us to emulate.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my respect for a great American and great Minnesotan, the late Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey.

All Minnesotans and all Americans owe Vice President Humphrey a large debt of gratitude for his 33 years of public service to our State and Nation.

Most Minnesotans who are old enough to have known Hubert Humphrey have their favorite "Humphrey story." Mine involves a joint recruiting effort on behalf of the University of Minnesota football team following Humphrey's return to the United States Senate.

I accompanied a young 17-year-old high school senior and his family from the Washington, DC area to Senator Humphrey's Capitol office. Never will I forget the recruiting pitch from the Senator:

Young man, the two greatest institutions in this world are the United States Senate and the University of Minnesota. I've been part of both of these great institutions, and so can you!

The young football prospect signed with the University of Minnesota.

Hubert Humphrey's charm, wit, humanity and compassion are a great legacy for all of us—Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative. He truly cared about people. It's highly appropriate that we honor Hubert H. Humphrey on this 80th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, in political terms, I was born and raised on Hubert Humphrey. As an elementary school student in 1960, I had reached an age when I began to understand about politics, and I was amazed that a Senator from my own State was running for the Presidency of the United States. Four years later in junior high I stayed up late watching our small screen black and white television set as Hubert Humphrey was nominated for the Vice-Presidency of our country. Even now I can remember how his speech energized the audience.

Hubert Humphrey was my Presidential choice as I attended my first DFL county convention in 1972.

I had the honor of meeting Hubert for the first time in 1976 when he and his wife Muriel invited all of the candidates running for the State senate to their lakeside home in Waverly. He and Muriel took great delight in teasing me about looking too young to be a candidate.

Later he returned to Minnesota to address those of us who had been elected. I was surprised that someone of his stature would take the time to become involved in a local issue concerning whether to build a first-class sports stadium in Minnesota. He placed great emphasis on the importance of building a first-class stadium, insisting that it would "put Minnesota on the map" and would be a sound investment in Minnesota's economic future. There was no need for Hubert to take a stand on such a controversial issue, but few people sitting in the Hubert H. Humphrey Metrodome today would disagree with his vision.

I continue to be proud that through the leadership of Hubert Humphrey, millions of Americans became involved in human rights and civil rights, and responded to the disabled and the elderly. I watched with admiration during

his last years in the U.S. Senate as he took the lead on arms control and world hunger.

Although Hubert H. Humphrey was a leader during some of America's most challenging years, he never lost faith in our people or our system of government. He was a tremendous inspiration to me and other Minnesota Democrats, and all of us can only hope that in some small way we follow his example of leadership and public service.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to join with my colleagues here in the House in tribute to one of the finest Americans ever to serve in the U.S. Congress.

Hubert Humphrey was more than "the Happy Warrior," as he was known to his colleagues in The Other Body for his witty, tireless and determined speeches ranging from promoting civil rights to protecting the elderly. To me, Senator and Vice President Hubert Humphrey was a great conscience of the Nation, and a personal role model.

Mr. Speaker, the Hubert Humphrey Building stands a short walk down Independence Avenue from this Chamber. When that building was dedicated in 1977 as what is now home to the Department of Health and Human Services, Vice President Humphrey said, and I quote, "It was once said that the moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life—the sick, the needy and the handicapped."

That was his philosophy of government: to make government work, to do its job as representatives of the people. Here in Washington, Hubert Humphrey fought that fight in the 1940's, 1950's, 1960's, and the 1970's.

Mr. Speaker, in the last years of public service, even as he fought a battle with cancer that would ultimately claim his life, the spark of his ideals and his hope for the future of our Nation never waned. He remained not only an inspiration but a voice of reason and vision.

Those of us who grew up with his ideals can only hope that his same spirit of public service remains in our hearts and minds into the next century. It is our loss that we can no longer call upon his wisdom to confront the new challenges facing our Nation and our world. But I know that I have been all the more fortunate for having had the opportunity to know and work with Hubert Humphrey, and I know that a grateful Nation will always remember him as one of the finest public servants of the people of the United States.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues in the Minnesota delegation for taking this time to pay tribute to one of this country's most distinguished public servants, Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey.

On the occasion of our late colleague's 80th birthday, I am proud to join in this special order to honor one Minnesota's most beloved favorite sons and a great American.

I was privileged to call him a friend and I know how much public service meant to him. He dedicated the great majority of his life to serving the people of Minnesota as U.S. Senator and then as Vice President under President Lyndon Johnson.

On June 3 another fine tribute was announced when the U.S. Postal Service issued

a stamp commemorating his years of service as part of its Great Americans series.

I will always remember what a fine public speaker Hubert was and those speeches were always sprinkled with his great wit. The name "Happy Warrior" fit him very well and I am glad we are taking time to reflect on the life and times of our friend. I appreciate the Minnesota delegation giving me the chance to take part in this tribute today.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, Hubert Horatio Humphrey, scholar, statesman, Senator, Vice President—husband, father.

Grounded in the beliefs of FDR's "New Deal" that every American matters—Humphrey developed a commitment to all Americans, particularly those in need.

As one of the architects of JFK's "New Frontier," Humphrey became its eloquent advocate.

And what Humphrey believed in, Hubert Humphrey acted upon.

A champion of the less fortunate in our society, Humphrey proved—throughout his life—that government's role is to protect the people—not to take advantage of them.

He proved that public service was not a stepping stone—but rather a life-long pursuit.

And at no time did he make this clearer—than at a speech he made less than 3 months before his death.

"It was once said that the moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life—the sick, the needy and the handicapped."

Hubert Humphrey was a Happy Warrior.

Happy to fight for those who could not fight for themselves—the sick, the elderly, the forgotten people in our society.

A warrior because he truly believed that this "moral test" for government was a crusade—a crusade against greed, poverty, and sickness.

This was Hubert Humphrey's war: a war we must continue to fight daily in this chamber—a war we must never lose.

A test that we as Members of this body must go through every day—to help those who cannot help themselves.

This is Hubert Humphrey's legacy to us.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are taking a few minutes today to remember Hubert Humphrey. He was a 20th century giant in American politics and no one was his equal as an eloquent and effective advocate for human and civil rights. His contribution to progressive policies and programs are a remarkable legacy for all Americans, and I am proud to have served with him in the Congress for many years.

I must tell you that I can not think about Hubert Humphrey without wondering what he would be doing about the current state of our Nation and the sad condition of our political affairs. I know he would be outraged by the flag-waving, race-baiting Presidential campaigns of recent years and he would be appealing to our better natures. He would be working for a comprehensive health program for all Americans and I am sure he would be developing programs to remedy a troubled economy that is crushing the dreams and aspirations of millions of our citizens. Hubert Humphrey would

be telling us we must do more and we must do better than we are doing.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], for the opportunity to pay tribute to the late Senator Hubert H. Humphrey on the 80th anniversary of his birth. It is with great pleasure that I take part in honoring Senator Humphrey. During 33 years of public service, Senator Humphrey dedicated himself to civil rights issues and the social welfare of the American people. While serving two terms as mayor of Minneapolis, 19 years in the U.S. Senate, and 4 years as vice president, he proved himself to be one of the greatest humanitarians of modern times.

The son of a South Dakota pharmacist, Senator Humphrey began his career as manager of the family store. After earning his B.A. and M.A. in political science from Louisiana State University, he was elected mayor of Minneapolis in 1945. As mayor, Senator Humphrey waged an anti-vice war, created the first municipal fair employment practices commission in the United States, and expanded the city's housing program. At the 1948 Democratic National Convention, he gave a stirring and courageous oration in favor of a strong civil rights plank. It was in this same year that Hubert Humphrey was elected Senator of his State of Minnesota.

Senator Humphrey focused his efforts in the Senate on promoting social welfare and civil rights legislation. In his earlier years in office, Senator Humphrey was the first to introduce a bill that would establish medical care for the aged, financed through the Social Security system. The program was enacted years later as Medicare. In the 1950's, Senator Humphrey was a leading advocate of disarmament which led to the creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1961. Also enacted in 1961 were Senator Humphrey's proposals of the Peace Corps and the Food for Peace programs. Ultimately, Senator Humphrey's crowning achievement was the passage of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, evidence of Senator Humphrey's longtime commitment to peace. And the climax of Senator Humphrey's long advocacy of the cause of equal rights was his involvement as floor manager in the passage of the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Elected as Vice President under President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1964, Senator Humphrey continued his advocacy for social welfare and civil rights causes in his newly elected position, during the years he spent in the Senate afterward, and until his death in 1978.

Through the many years that he spent in public office, Senator Humphrey was not merely an advocate of various causes. More importantly, Hubert Humphrey was an advocate for the people. Senator Humphrey believed that all people are entitled to the same basic human rights and needs, and he fought to bring this dream of his closer to reality. It is with great gratitude and respect that I join my colleagues in recognizing the goals and achievements of Hubert H. Humphrey on this day, the 80th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join with our Minnesota colleagues and others to honor a great American, a great U.S. Senator, a great Vice President—Hubert H. Humphrey.

This year marks the 80th anniversary of Hubert Humphrey's birth, and on June 3 the U.S. Postal Service, fittingly, issued a stamp commemorating his service to the Nation as part of its "Great American" series.

I've long been an admirer of Senator Humphrey and the model he provided for public service. He was a man of strong humanitarian convictions in the Midwestern, progressive mold. But he was a practical man as well—not doctrinaire—willing and able to work with diverse people to reach a consensus and move ahead.

Some years ago, I saw a quotation from Senator Humphrey, and clipped it and have had it on my desk ever since. Here's what he said:

If I believe in something, I will fight for it with all I have, but I do not demand all or nothing. I would rather get something than nothing. Professional liberals want the fiery debate. They glory in defeat. The hardest job for a politician today is to have the courage to be a moderate.

My own personal exposure to Senator Humphrey and his work came when I was a young, admiring Senate aide back in the 1960's. I was fortunate enough to secure an internship in 1963 with Senator E.L. "Bob" Bartlett from Alaska, and I returned to Washington for four summers after that to work in various legislative positions in Senator Bartlett's office. I thus was in a position to observe Senator Humphrey both as a leader in the Senate and then as Vice President.

During those years, I was also writing a doctoral dissertation on the Senate based on my work and my observations there. It was my sense that the institution was changing significantly and that the changes marked a decisive shift—from what some termed the Senate of "the inner club," the Senate of the old established "folkways"—into a more open, more progressive, more activist institution.

Nelson Polsby, a well-respected political scientist from the University of California at Berkeley, has written about those years and about the transition that occurred in the Senate. And he has characterized, appropriately I think, Hubert Humphrey as the prototype of the "new Senator." Humphrey was a Senator who knew very well the folkways of the institution, who knew very well how to work effectively in the institution, but who was testing the limits and was establishing a new model for a U.S. Senator. He was then followed by many others who opened up that institution—who used it as a forum for policy debate, for policy innovation—and indeed, made of the Senate, a critical nerve end of the American polity. That was the Senate that I was observing in the 1960's; that was the Senate that I wrote about in my dissertation which was later published as "Who Makes The Laws?" Polsby described the new style of service—the Humphrey prototype—in the following way:

Much earlier than most members of his generation, Humphrey sensed the possibilities in the Senate for long-range political education. He spent the Eisenhower era incubating ideas that in a better climate could hatch into programs. In the late 1940's and early 1950's a flood of Humphrey bills (many of them co-sponsored by other liberal sen-



ators) on all aspects of civil rights, medicare, housing, aid to farm workers, food stamps, job corps, area redevelopment, disarmament, and so on died in the Senate. A little over a decade later most of them were law, and Humphrey had in the meantime become a political leader of national consequence. The force of his example was not lost on younger senators.

Indeed it was not. In fact, the Humphrey model was emulated by Members like Philip Hart and Edmund Muskie and Joseph Clark and many others in the Senate of the middle and late 1960's, even as Humphrey himself went on to serve as Vice President. And it is important to note that even as he knew how and when to compromise, to moderate his objectives, he also knew how to persevere, to press on in the sure knowledge that a new political day would dawn.

I confess I have a special reason for wanting to pay tribute to Hubert Humphrey today. Last year, my professional association, the American Political Science Association, paid me the signal tribute of awarding the Hubert H. Humphrey Public Service Award, an award that I cherish and feel very honored to receive, but an award that has a very special meaning to me because of the great Senator and public servant after whom it is named.

So because of my early experiences as a Senate aide and as an academic studying Congress, and now as a Member of Congress myself, I have a special sense of the role Hubert Humphrey played in transforming this institution, and serving as a role model to which all of us can aspire. It's because of all this that I was especially eager to participate in this special order today and to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this remarkable man.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JACOBS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of constituent business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following member (at the request of Mr. RIGGS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGRICH for 60 minutes on July 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LAROCO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio, for 60 minutes, on July 26.

Mr. MINETA, for 60 minutes, on July 25.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KOLBE.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. RHODES in four instances.

Mr. SHAW.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in three instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. MACHTELEY.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in three instances.

Mr. GILMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TRAXLER.

Mr. GAYDOS.

Mr. OWENS of New York.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

Mrs. BOXER.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. TORRES.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. MRAZEK.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan.

Mr. LUKE.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. SLATTERY.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

Mr. HARRIS.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 276. An act to designate the Federal building located at 1520 Market Street in St. Louis, Missouri as the "L. Douglas Abram Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, 1991, at 12 noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1657. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for fiscal year 1991 and fiscal year 1992 appropriations for the Department of Defense in support of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (Doc. No. 102-109); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1658. A letter from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department plans to transfer the final \$47,548 million to the operation and maintenance appropriations for the modernization and expansion of automated data processing systems; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1659. A letter from the Chief, Legislative Liaison of the Department of the Army, transmitting an initial decision to retain the commissary storage and warehousing function at the Army Research and Development Center, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ, as an in-house operation, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1660. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting notification that major defense acquisition programs have breached the unit cost by more than 15 percent, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2431(b)(3)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1661. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a request for T45TS Defense Enterprise Program baseline approval, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2437; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1662. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2352 of title 10, United States Code, to allow research and development contracts to be for a term of not more than 10 years, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to approve up to two additional performance periods, each for not more than 5 years, when found to be in the best interests of the Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1663. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 151(a), 154, and 155(a) of title 10, United States Code, to provide for designation of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a full member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and to make conforming amendments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1664. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Department of Defense Laboratory Revitalization Demonstration Program for the purpose of improving management, efficiency, and overall effectiveness of DOD laboratories and centers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1665. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 91-32, reporting that it is in the

national interest for the Export-Import Bank to extend credit to Mongolia, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(2); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1666. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the second annual report describing the status of multifamily housing subject to subsection (a) of section 203(k) of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1701z-11; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1667. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Kingdom of Thailand, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1668. A letter from the President, Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Oversight Board for the calendar year 1990, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 501(a) (103 Stat. 387); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1669. A letter from the President, Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Oversight Board of the Resolution Funding Corporation for the calendar year 1990, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 511(a) (103 Stat. 404); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1670. A letter from the President, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting notification that the Corporation is unable to forward GAO's audit of the financial statements of the RTC; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1671. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the condition of bilingual education in the Nation, pursuant to Public Law 100-297, section 6213 (102 Stat. 429); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1672. A letter from the Department of Energy, transmitting the Annual Energy Review 1990, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1673. A letter from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting a report to public broadcasting and telecommunications entities service to minority and diverse audiences, pursuant to Public Law 100-626, section 9(a) (102 Stat. 3211); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1674. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a final audit report entitled "Accounting for Reimbursement Expenditures of Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Money, Bureau of Reclamation," to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1675. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of an Internal Revenue Service internal audit report entitled, "Review of Reimbursable Superfund Costs—Fiscal Year 1988," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 7501 note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1676. A letter from the Chairman, Physician Payment Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's report on physician payment under Medicaid, pursuant to section 6102(f)(1)(B) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1677. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Greece for defense articles and services esti-

mated to cost \$176 million (Transmittal No. 91-30), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1678. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 91-37), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1679. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Australia (Transmittal No. 10-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1680. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Bolivia (Transmittal No. 9-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1681. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity of technology or capability to Kuwait, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1682. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to the Republic of Korea (Transmittal No. MC-42-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c), (d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1683. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially under a contract in the amount of \$50 million or more to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. MC-28-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1684. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original reports of political contributions by Robert Michael Kimmitt, of Virginia, Ambassador-designate to the Federal Republic of Germany, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1685. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report regarding a proposed sale and coproduction relating to the Korean Fighter Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1686. A letter from the Department of State, transmitting notification that the Department has decided to offer senior level crisis management training to selected Bulgarian officials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1687. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on recent activities of the International Fund for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1688. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on assistance related to international terrorism provided by the U.S. Government to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1689. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the final pay-as-you-go estimates of legislation enacted as of June 14, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 1310(a) (104 Stat.

1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1690. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all reports issued by GAO in May 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1691. A letter from the Fourth District Farm Credit Institutions, transmitting the Farm Credit Institutions in the Fourth District amended retirement plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1692. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 24th in a series of reports on refugee resettlement in the United States covering the period October 1, 1989, through September 30, 1990, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1693. A letter from the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 1990 annual report of independent auditors who have audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, a federally chartered corporation, pursuant to Public Law 88-376, section 14(b) (78 Stat. 323); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1694. A letter from the Counsel, Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the annual audit report of the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden, calendar year 1990, pursuant to Public Law 88-449, section 10(b) (78 Stat. 498); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1695. A letter from the U.S. Olympic Committee, transmitting the annual audit and activities report for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 382a(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1696. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a prospectus for the Environmental Protection Agency, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1697. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a copy of the National Implementation Plan for Modernization and Associated Restructuring of the National Weather Service, Fiscal Year 1991 Annual Update, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 313 note; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1698. A letter from the Executive Director, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's status report for the month of May 1991 (Review of 1988-89 FSLIC Assistance Agreements; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1699. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report entitled, "Toxic Chemicals: EPA's Toxic Release Inventory Is Useful But Can Be Improved"; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Energy and Commerce.

1700. A letter from the Department of Justice, transmitting notification that the Department of Justice will contest, or will refrain from defending, any provision of law enacted by the Congress in any proceeding before any court of the United States with respect to 31 U.S.C. 3554(c), a provision of the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984, pursuant to Public Law 96-132, section 21(a)(2) (93 Stat. 1050); jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Government Operations.

1701. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of his certification and determination that it is in the national interest to waive the transfer of foreign assist-



ance funds under the Fishermen's Protective Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1975; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Foreign Affairs.

1702. A letter from the Director, National Ocean Pollution Program Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Review of Fiscal Year 1992 Agency Requests for Appropriations to Support Ocean Pollution Research, Development, and Monitoring Programs"; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Science, Space, and Technology.

1703. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the 18th actuarial valuation of the railroad retirement system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 321f-1; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1704. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 1991 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on Government Operations. A citizen's guide on using the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act of 1974 to request Government records (Rept. 102-146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHEAT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 190. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2282, a bill to amend the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1988, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 191. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 656, a bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research program to ensure continued U.S. leadership in high-performance computing (Rept. 102-148). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 192. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1989, a bill to authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 102-149). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. JACOBS):

H.R. 2838. A bill to improve benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, to remove Social Security administrative costs from the budget, to increase the Social Security benefit and contribution base, and to provide for a study of factors impeding the efficiency of the Social Security disability determination process; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. SABO):

H.R. 2839. A bill to provide a program of Federal supplemental compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 2840. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reduce human exposure to lead in residences, schools for young children, and day care centers, including exposure to lead in drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize veterans who are totally disabled as the result of a service-connected disability to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces are entitled to travel on such aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize disabled former prisoners of war to use Department of Defense commissary stores and exchanges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2843. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of incentive special pay to Department of Veterans Affairs psychologists who obtain board certification in a professional specialty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2844. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to determine the validity of the claims of certain Filipinos that they performed military service on behalf of the United States during World War II; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2845. A bill to provide for the establishment in Hawaii of a Department of Veterans Affairs posttraumatic stress disorder treatment program; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (by request):

H.R. 2846. A bill to repeal the requirement that the President acquire depleted uranium for the National Defense Stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUNNING (by request):

H.R. 2847. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to restore the rate of duty applicable to man-made fiber felt fabric for technical uses that was in effect under the Tariff Schedules of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

H.R. 2848. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to provide child care services to all members of the Armed Forces on active duty desiring such services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARR:

H.R. 2849. A bill to require employers to provide certain information concerning family leave policies and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself (by request), Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. MYERS of Indiana):

H.R. 2850. A bill to make technical and conforming changes in title 5, United States Code, and the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FISH, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 2851. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent racially discriminatory capital sentencing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 2852. A bill to amend title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote articulation agreements between 2-year and 4-year institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HENRY (for himself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 2853. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the percentage of completion method of accounting shall not be required to be used with respect to contracts for the manufacture of property if no payments are required to be made before the completion of the manufacture of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 2854. A bill to provide for the labeling or marking of tropical wood and tropical wood products sold in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCLOSKEY:

H.R. 2855. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to determine whether individuals entitled to benefits under the Medicare Program meet the requirements for status as qualified Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicaid Program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MAVEROULES, and Mr. SWIFT):

H.R. 2856. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from collecting alleged overpayments made to certain Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MANTON (for himself and Ms. MOLINARI):

H.R. 2857. A bill to provide for the death penalty for homicides involving firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2858. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to impose mandatory prison terms for possession or use of a firearm or a destructive device during conduct constituting a crime of violence or a drug trafficking crime under State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAVROULES:

H.R. 2859. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the historical and cultural resources in the vicinity of the city of Lynn, MA, and make recommendations on the appropriate role of the Federal Government in preserving and interpreting such historical and cultural resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Ms. MOLINARI:

H.R. 2860. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include death benefits for retired officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey):

H.R. 2861. A bill directing the U.S. Postal Service to promulgate regulations to protect postal employees and the U.S. mail from exposure to medical waste; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H.R. 2862. A bill to require any person who is convicted of a State criminal offense against a victim who is a minor to register a current address with law enforcement officials of the State for 10 years after release from prison, parole, or supervision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 2863. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of the basis of certain assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. DOWNEY):

H.R. 2864. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish an elder rights program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHAEFER:

H.R. 2865. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs with respect to health care areas, to provide for the establishment of model programs in behavioral health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 2866. A bill to encourage the use of alternative fuels across the transportation sector and facilitate research on the design of motor vehicles powered by these fuels, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Public Works and Transportation, Science, Space, and Technology, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 2867. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to certain income-producing real property of the debtor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LONG (for herself, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HATCHER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SARPALIUS, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.J. Res. 293. Joint resolution designating March 19, 1992, as "National Women in Agriculture Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.J. Res. 294. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning August 11, 1991, as "National Convenience Store Appreciation Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.J. Res. 295. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution entitled "a joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as 'Captive Nations Week'"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Russian people and Boris Yeltsin on his election as the first democratically elected President in the history of the Russian Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

214. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Alaska, relative to the existing Federal mining law system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

213. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Delaware, relative to the dual banking system; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

215. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to giving Indian tribes jurisdiction over Indians who are not on the official tribal rolls; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

216. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to the recovery of Lahontan cutthroat trout in Nevada; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

217. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to rehabilitation programs for veterans with service-connected brain injuries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

218. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Federal oil leases in the North Aleutian Basin section of Bristol Bay; jointly, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE introduced a bill (H.R. 2868) relating to the reliquidation of certain entries; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 44: Mr. SWIFT and Mr. GILMAN.  
H.R. 123: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 199: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.  
H.R. 213: Mr. FROST, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 258: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.  
H.R. 303: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. BLAZ.

H.R. 304: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. SARPALIUS, and Mr. GINGRICH.  
H.R. 318: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 330: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. JACOBS, and Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 392: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 413: Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. LAROCO, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 416: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 441: Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 544: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mrs. MINK.

H.R. 565: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New

York, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 585: Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 592: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 606: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 784: Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. LUKEN.

H.R. 815: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 828: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 916: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 945: Mr. GALLO, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 967: Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 1069: Mr. FROST and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 1092: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1111: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 1120: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1130: Mrs. LOWEY of New York and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1145: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1146: Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 1147: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 1156: Mr. FROST and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1184: Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1201: Mr. ESPY and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 1287: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 1298: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1346: Mr. SYNAR and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1348: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 1360: Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 1389: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1400: Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1406: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. YATES, Mr. SENBRENNER, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1417: Mr. KOPETSKI and Mr. PICKLE.

H.R. 1422: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1445: Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 1450: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. BLAZ, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 1456: Mr. ROSE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1472: Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1473: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 1483: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1503: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1515: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 1516: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1527: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. PETERSON of Florida.



H.R. 1556: Mr. GOODLING.  
 H.R. 1570: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, and Mr. STOKES.  
 H.R. 1599: Mr. GILLMOR.  
 H.R. 1601: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1652: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. ZELIFF.  
 H.R. 1662: Mr. PRICE.  
 H.R. 1684: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 1737: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. ESPY.  
 H.R. 1750: Ms. DELAURIO.  
 H.R. 1752: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. RHODES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. SANDERS.  
 H.R. 1753: Mr. RIGGS, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.  
 H.R. 1809: Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. RINALDO, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CAMP.  
 H.R. 1816: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1821: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. STOKES.  
 H.R. 1860: Mr. BUSTAMANTE and Mr. WEBER.  
 H.R. 1914: Mr. STOKES.  
 H.R. 1916: Ms. DELAURIO and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.  
 H.R. 1992: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. BYRON, and Mr. SCHEUER.  
 H.R. 2008: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. HASTERT.  
 H.R. 2012: Mr. Roe, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mr. VALENTINE.  
 H.R. 2015: Mr. MARTIN.  
 H.R. 2059: Mr. BUSTAMANTE and Mr. INHOFE.  
 H.R. 2063: Mr. RINALDO.  
 H.R. 2086: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 2109: Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 2115: Mr. MFUME.  
 H.R. 2137: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mrs. BOXER.  
 H.R. 2149: Mr. COYNE and Mr. VANDER JAGT.  
 H.R. 2235: Mr. HERGER.  
 H.R. 2248: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. JONES of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2262: Ms. LONG, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. PATTERSON.  
 H.R. 2273: Mrs. SCHROEDER.  
 H.R. 2286: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ZIMMER.  
 H.R. 2298: Mr. OWENS of New York.  
 H.R. 2334: Mr. FIOLETTA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 2352: Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. CARDIN.  
 H.R. 2363: Mr. ESPY and Mr. OWENS of New York.  
 H.R. 2365: Mr. ESPY and Mr. INHOFE.  
 H.R. 2374: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. FORD of Michigan.  
 H.R. 2393: Mr. BLAZ and Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 2394: Mr. BLAZ and Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 2405: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mrs. MINK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. DICKINSON.  
 H.R. 2406: Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. HERGER.  
 H.R. 2452: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PEASE, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. KOPETSKI.  
 H.R. 2470: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. PETRI.  
 H.R. 2488: Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 2515: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. ROUKEMA,

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SKELTON.  
 H.R. 2553: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.  
 H.R. 2568: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. KYL, and Mr. KLUG.  
 H.R. 2590: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, and Mr. WALSH.  
 H.R. 2598: Mr. GALLO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.  
 H.R. 2600: Mr. EVANS and Mr. WOLPE.  
 H.R. 2603: Mr. FALCOMAVALGA and Mr. HORTON.  
 H.R. 2611: Ms. WATERS and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.  
 H.R. 2625: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROE, and Mr. BOEHNER.  
 H.R. 2628: Mr. EVANS and Mr. PERKINS.  
 H.R. 2629: Mr. RIGGS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ROE, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. BERMAN.  
 H.R. 2651: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEACH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. BOUCHER.  
 H.R. 2666: Mr. PICKLE.  
 H.R. 2672: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GALLO, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. KOLTER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. GILCHREST.  
 H.R. 2751: Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. RIGGS.  
 H.R. 2755: Mr. HORTON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. FALCOMAVALGA, Mr. MOODY, Mr. YATES, and Mrs. MORELLA.  
 H.R. 2768: Mr. BREWSTER.  
 H.R. 2778: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. WILSON.  
 H.R. 2788: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. HYDE.  
 H.R. 2812: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. PRICE.  
 H.R. 2815: Mr. LEWIS of Florida.  
 H.J. Res. 23: Mr. GONZALEZ.  
 H.J. Res. 67: Mr. BROWDER and Mr. JONTZ.  
 H.J. Res. 69: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.  
 H.J. Res. 123: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. ASPIN.  
 H.J. Res. 140: Mr. McGRATH, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HORN, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. ALEXANDER.  
 H.J. Res. 156: Mr. BAKER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.  
 H.J. Res. 175: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FISH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ORTON,

Mr. RUSSO, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.  
 H.J. Res. 177: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FROST, and Mr. MICHEL.  
 H.J. Res. 178: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. MCCREY.  
 H.J. Res. 181: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. WOLF.  
 H.J. Res. 191: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. ESPY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SWETT, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SERRANO, and Mrs. BOXER.  
 H.J. Res. 227: Mr. ROE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. YATES.  
 H.J. Res. 233: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. McHUGH.  
 H.J. Res. 237: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ROE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. TALLON.  
 H.J. Res. 241: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FROST, Mr. McGRATH, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.  
 H.J. Res. 242: Mr. COOPER, Mr. ECKART, Mr. HAMILTON, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SWETT.  
 H.J. Res. 243: Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. DIXON.  
 H.J. Res. 255: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FROST, Mr. PRICE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. WYLIE, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. McEWEEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr.

WALSH, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MINETA, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. HENRY.

H.J. Res. 273: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FALBOMAVAEGA, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 274: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MCDADE.

H. Con. Res. 11: Mr. RAHALL.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. SERRANO.

H. Con. Res. 101: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FROST, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H. Con. Res. 166: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. YATES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H. Con. Res. 171: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LENT, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr.

SCHUEER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. FROST.

H. Res. 173: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. INHOFE.

### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1782: Mr. TRAFICANT.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

98. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to congratulating the Government of Israel on its Ethiopian Rescue Mission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

99. Also, petition of the Office of the District Attorney, Richmond County, NY, relative to the oilspill into the Arthur Kill Waterway and operations of interstate pipelines under waterways; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

100. Also, petition of the Legislative Research Commission, Frankfort, KY, relative to missing servicemen; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

101. Also, petition of the County Council, County of Kauai, HI, relative to the exclusion from Social Security withholding, any earnings by election officials on election day; to the Committee on Ways and Means.